

by trying to write it into law. All it does is put a great premium on the witnesses who have the most organization to help them prepare and distribute their testimony.

Another requirement is that the committee staff summarize this testimony in advance for members. In my opinion, that is a completely useless and unreasonable misuse of committee staff. For one thing, it is the witness who knows the salient features of his testimony, and which points he is most anxious to get across. It should not be left up to the staff to interpret his testimony. If statements are received in advance, they should be forwarded to the offices of individual members for any advance summary their office staffs wish to prepare in order to flag the points in which they are interested.

More important is the burden this would impose on the staff of a committee that may have its hands full trying to organize and run hearings, sometimes every day for days at a time.

A third requirement that is burdensome and unnecessary is that of preparing summaries after the testimony is taken, as well as before. This summary must be printed as part of the hearing record.

When would a staff that has been in hearings all day and must return to them at 10 a.m. the next morning have time to summarize 8 hours of testimony? On top of that, the majority and minority have to agree on the summary of the testimony. This task would take the full time of at least one staff member, probably one from minority and majority staffs. I see no advantage to be gained from it. Hearings are generally indexed, and members and their office staffs can read what they need to know from hearings.

Section 104, as I read it, goes back to the old practice of prohibiting committee meetings, except for hearings, when the Senate is in session, including the morning hour. Agreement of the majority and minority leaders may be obtained for hearings, but I gather that no executive business can be transacted during the morning hour. This would seem to impede more than it would expedite committee business.

Section 105 creates the post and duties of a review specialist.

No doubt every committee wishes it were better equipped to supervise the administration of laws that are passed by the committee. But I challenge the concept that one person, a "review specialist" is the way to equip a committee for this purpose.

Most of our professional committee staff members are experts in an area of legislative business. They are the people who should assume the review duties in that area. To expect one man to cut across the whole spectrum of committee business and make himself an expert on every subject so he can oversee its administration is entirely unrealistic.

I would hope this section could be rewritten so as to leave the duties it provides for to be carried out at the discretion of the committee. That way we can use our personnel more effectively than this section as now written will permit.

Finally, I have serious doubts about the wisdom or virtue of excluding the Appropriations Committee from the many procedures that are applied to other committees. I see no reason to exclude the Appropriations Committee from the reduction in membership that is applied to other committees. The Appropriations Committee handles money; other committees handle authorizations. That is the only distinction, and I see nothing in it that should elevate the Appropriations Committee above the will of the Senate as applied to all other standing committees.

Let me add that I do not doubt the Senate will continue to operate if all the present provisions of S. 355 are enacted. But we will act much more slowly than we do now. There will be many more requests for unanimous consent; likewise there will be many more objections by individual Senators, for there will be many more rules that can be invoked to hinder committees and the Senate from acting.

These sections of the bill may change Senate rules; but they do not reform the Senate.

AUTHORITY TO PRINT AS SENATE DOCUMENT A SERIES OF ARTICLES ENTITLED, "U.S. SUPREME COURT UPSETS TRADITION" (S. DOC. NO. 3)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of articles written by Dick Kirkpatrick, chief of the Cincinnati Enquirer's Washington office, entitled "U.S. Supreme Court Upsets Tradition" be compiled and printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance

with the previous order, that the Senate adjourn until noon on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Monday, January 30, 1967.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 26, 1967:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

John L. Sweeney, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Joe W. Flemming II, of Arkansas, to be Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 26, 1967:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Idar Rimestad, of North Dakota, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Deputy Under Secretary of State.

John F. Henning, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

David S. King, of Utah, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Malagasy Republic.

Robert L. Payton, of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Cameroon.

Clarence A. Boonstra, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Costa Rica.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Eugene Victor Rostow, of Connecticut, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 5 years and U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years.

UNITED NATIONS

William B. Buffum, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the deputy representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Arthur E. Goldschmidt, of New York, to be the U.S. representative to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Richard F. Pedersen, of California, to be deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 26, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father Patrick J. Nagle, Sacred Heart Church, La Plata, Md., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

O God of all, as of old our fathers prayed, so do we now:

"Lift up Thy hand over the strange nations that they may see Thy power—that they may know Thee as we also have

known Thee, that there is no God beside Thee, O Lord."

Take from us all false pride and foolish thoughts of self-glory. Instead, let us see in Thy divine plan and gracious purpose self-perfection and the desire to lead others by just and proper legislation to this end.

Glorification, whole and entire, of Thy name and a lasting reward from Thy hand—peace in our times.

This more than all else we ask of Thee. A good conscience, peace within our native country and with all nations.

We ask it in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84-1028, appointed Mr. PASTORE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. BURDICK to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84-1028, appointed Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CASE, and Mr. MORTON to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84-1028, appointed Mr. STENNIS, Mr. ALLOT, and Mr. THURMOND to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 79-304, appointed Mr. RIBCOFF to be a member of the Joint Economic Committee.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86-380, appointed Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mr. MUNDT to be members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86-417, appointed Mr. RANDOLPH to be a member of the James Madison Memorial Commission.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 420, 83d Congress, appointed Mr. BREWSTER to be a member of the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 250, 77th Congress, appointed Mr. ALLOT to be a member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 89-187, appointed Mr. NELSON to be a

member of the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 754, 81st Congress, appointed Mr. FRANCIS R. VALEO to the Federal Records Council in lieu of Mr. Emery L. Frazier, retired.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 87-758, appointed Mr. MAGNUSON to be a member of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84-372, appointed Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. BROOKE to be members of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

THE SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 15 United States Code 1024(a), as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Economic Committee the following members on the part of the House: Mr. PATMAN, of Texas; Mr. BOLLING, of Missouri; Mr. BOGGS, of Louisiana; Mr. REUSS, of Wisconsin; Mrs. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan; Mr. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania; Mr. CURTIS, of Missouri; Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey; Mr. RUMSFELD, of Illinois; and Mr. BROCK, of Tennessee.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO INTRODUCES MEASURE TO MAKE COLUMBUS DAY A NATIONAL LEGAL HOLIDAY

MR. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MR. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a measure today, which I had introduced in the 89th Congress, to make Columbus Day a national legal holiday.

Thirty-eight States have already declared Columbus Day a legal holiday, but national recognition of Christopher Columbus' momentous discovery has been withheld all these many years. It is indeed an oversight on the part of the Congress of the United States to withhold this national recognition, particularly when we realize that the development of our great country, as well as the development of the whole Western Hemisphere, resulted from Columbus' discovery in 1492.

The importance of Columbus' achievement was best expressed by the eminent Harvard scholar, Samuel Eliot Morrison, who said:

His four voyages—the first in 1492-93; the second, in which the Lesser Antilles and southern Cuba were discovered, in 1493-94; the third, in which he first touched the mainland, in 1497-98; and the fourth, in 1502-04, in which he discovered the unknown shores of the western Caribbean—are the most important in modern history.

Thus, not only we in North America, but our neighbors in South America as well, owe a tremendous debt to Christopher Columbus for opening up the New World. Our neighbors in South America recognize this debt and each year pay tribute to the memory of Columbus.

Almost every country in South America, including Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela celebrate "Día de la Raza" on October 12 each year. They recognize that Christopher Columbus' discovery on this day marked the actual beginning of their countries and their cultures.

It is unfortunate that we in the United States do not celebrate Columbus Day as a national legal holiday, for if we did, we could join hands with our brothers and sisters in South America in a joint celebration of the one event which holds such profound meaning for all of us. Perhaps, by extending our hand in friendship and by celebrating this holiday together, we could create a more hospitable atmosphere for settling some of the vital social and economic problems which confront us.

Of all the outstanding men whose deeds have made an imperishable record in the hearts and minds of men and women through the ages, it is Columbus whose fame will last forever. Perhaps his achievement is more meaningful for us today than it was for previous generations, because we face the vastness of outer space in the same way that Columbus faced the expanse of the uncharted ocean. Despite all obstacles and hazards, despite primitive navigational equipment, this great Italian found land and achieved the most spectacular and important geographical discovery in the history of our planet.

The qualities that made Columbus great—stubborn persistence despite discouragement and danger, indomitable will, faith in God, and absolute fearlessness—are qualities which our early settlers possessed, which our courageous pioneers demonstrated as they opened up the West, and which our great industrialists and labor leaders have used in building the successful economic enterprises and achieving the remarkable industrial advances that have made our country the greatest nation in the world.

Today, we have more people employed than at any time in our history. Our country is enjoying the greatest prosperity we have ever known. Our gross national product is over \$740 billion and by 1972 it is predicted that our gross national product will reach over \$1 trillion.

In this era of prosperity and progress, it is hard to believe that there are those who would oppose making Columbus Day a national legal holiday. Yet, there are some few who have put a material value on the holiday, and claim that the closing of our Government offices, our schools, our banks, and other public places would cost too much money.

When one considers, however, the great prosperity in our country, the overabundance of goods, and our constantly growing and expanding economy, this excuse

of cost becomes weak, flimsy, and ineffective.

Mr. Speaker, the magnificent courage and boundless imagination of Columbus made possible the discovery of our country where today the greater democracy ever known to man is flourishing. His indomitable spirit has become a part of us and our way of life. Today, our astronauts who explore outer space are manifesting the same dauntless spirit that Columbus demonstrated when he sailed an uncharted and trackless ocean to find America.

Our debt to Columbus is profound. No longer can we deny him national recognition. The other body, during the 88th Congress, recognized this debt, and in an effort to give Columbus the recognition he justly deserves, passed on August 15, 1964, a bill introduced by Senator J. CALEB BOGGS, of Delaware, to make Columbus Day a national legal holiday. Unfortunately, this bill never came to the floor of the House for action, and died in the House Judiciary Committee. The Representatives, both Republicans and Democrats, from the 38 States which have already made October 12 a State legal holiday never had an opportunity to vote on this legislation.

These States include: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Maryland, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

I urge my colleagues from these States to join me in introducing legislation to make Columbus Day a national legal holiday, and I call upon all of the Members of the House to join in enacting my measure to make Columbus Day a national legal holiday. By working together, we can insure this long overdue recognition for Christopher Columbus.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, the Republic of the Ukraine proclaimed its independence. Free from Czarist tyranny the Ukrainian people set about the nation-building process. Unfortunately, their independent status soon vanished. In 1920 they were besieged by the Red Army. There followed a bitter 3-year struggle, ending with the suppression of the Ukraine and its incorporation into the Soviet Union. Again during World War II the Ukraine served as a battleground when the Nazi armies swept through it. Following the Nazis' defeat the Soviet Union quickly reestablished control. Today, 45 million Ukrainians live under Soviet dom-

ination. They constitute the largest non-Russian ethnic group living under the Kremlin regime.

This brief chronology of the 49 years following the Ukrainian proclamation of independence is a sad commentary of its short-lived freedom. Even more tragic is the fact that its suppression is not an isolated historical event. Throughout man's history is witnessed the greed of one nation feeding upon another. Avarice has been the rule of conduct in too many cases.

Fortunately, the peoples of the captive nations have not assented willingly to foreign rule, nor have they surrendered their allegiances to the possible reestablishment of sovereign homelands. Whatever alien sanctions that have been imposed on them have not constrained their nationalism. Their fervent devotion to freedom and autonomy is an inspiring record.

With the 49th anniversary of the Ukraine Republic's birth being observed this past Sunday, it is appropriate that we renew our expressions for the future hopes of that beleaguered nation. It is entirely fitting that we take time to honor and observe the birthdate of the Republic of the Ukraine, a nation whose identity and existence are masked by alien domination.

THE CREDIBILITY GAP IN SACRAMENTO

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following column of Doris Fleeson which appeared in the January 24 Evening Star:

RONALD REAGAN SHEDS HIS MODERATE IMAGE
(By Doris Fleeson)

The long and astute buildup of Gov. Ronald Reagan as a political moderate has collapsed with the sudden firing of Dr. Clark Kerr as president of the University of California.

The new governor was attending his first meeting as ex-officio member of the board of regents when he voted for the ouster. So was Lt. Gov. Robert Finch, another professed moderate and ex-officio member who voted aye. So was Reagan appointee Allen Grant, head of the State Board of Agriculture, an ex-officio regent because the University of California is a land-grant college.

Grant, a member of the State Right to Work Committee, in fact made the original motion to oust Kerr. Surprised conservatives, Republican and Democrat, grinned happily as these signals from Sacramento kept coming.

The Grant motion was deemed too harsh, however, by Regent Lawrence Kennedy, a maverick Democrat appointed by former Gov. Edmund G. Brown, and it was the Kennedy substitute that prevailed. It was far from the first resolution Kennedy has offered, but it is the first that has ever prevailed.

As these circumstances spread through the news media and educational circles, increasing emphasis was put on the political aspect of the story. It could not be otherwise. Re-

gan had promised in his campaign to "keep the university out of politics." In his first significant act as governor, he had put it in, breathing new life into his 1964 image as the darling of the Goldwaterites.

Republicans here pinned their first reactions to the horrid thought that their extreme right-wingers had not gone down with Barry Goldwater. A few foresaw another bitter and divisive primary campaign in 1968, dimming their present cheerful prospects.

Others comforted themselves with the notion that it is better to know early rather than too late that Reagan's political instincts are at the service of the right-wingers. All are astonished that he did not exercise more patience and prudence, as he has made it so plain that he intends to use his state's power on the national political scene.

Early reports about the scene within the board of regents were confusing. The governor in particular made some statements that other regents do not support. Comment on "the credibility gap in Sacramento" is widespread.

This is as it may be, but Kerr, a distinguished educator with a difficult and complicated job, has been summarily dismissed by newcomers with neither educational nor administrative experience, as if he were an errand office boy. The far right and the new left, enemies who should make sensible people think hard before assisting their goals, wanted Kerr out and have prevailed.

Reagan has been discovering that campaign promises come easily but that delivering on them is another story. He promised to reduce real estate taxes but finds he then must raise others.

No doubt he was angry when Kerr criticized cuts for education and fought Reagan-proposed tuition fees for California residents. Yet Kerr could not do less than defend the educational system that has put California, land-grant college though it is, in competition with the greatest schools in this country and the world.

HIGHER EDUCATION THE LOSER IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following January 23 Edwardsville, Ill., *Intelligencer* editorial:

REAGAN WINS PYRRHIC VICTORY

Enemies of academic tolerance will probably cheer the firing of Dr. Clark Kerr, as president of the University of California by the state board of regents.

But to those truly concerned with the quality of higher education in California, as well as the national implication of Dr. Kerr's removal, the ouster is a heavy blow.

In Dr. Kerr's eight-year tenure as president, the university has become ranked in educational circles among the top state universities in the country.

The quality of the faculty has increased, also. The university has more Nobel Prize winners on its staff than any other in the country.

Opponents of Dr. Kerr would say, at this point, that student quality has deteriorated. They will point to the unrest at the Berkeley campus during 1965 and 1966, the Free Speech and Filthy Speech movements, the student boycotts and demonstrations, and Dr. Kerr's refusal to take heavy-handed action against student strike leaders.

What they seem to forget is that Berkeley is only one of the University of California's nine campuses.

They overlook the fact that student unrest has not been limited to Berkeley alone, but has been seen on other campuses, both public and private, across the country.

They neglect to point out that many educators consider the 1965 Berkeley student revolt to have been justified, that the university administration had erred in taking away from students some political rights, or that the 1966 boycott failed because the students' case that time just did not have merit.

Dr. Kerr will not have to worry about his future. His talents are known and surely will be desired by other academic systems.

The cause of higher education in California, however, may be severely disrupted by Dr. Kerr's removal. Many good professors who support Dr. Kerr may seek employment elsewhere. Students who recognize his values and goals may stage rebellions of their own.

The board of regents once before recognized the worth of Dr. Kerr. That was in 1965, when Dr. Kerr resigned to protest certain decisions of the board regarding the student revolt.

A majority of the regents, realizing that they could not afford to lose a man of his convictions and caliber, persuaded Dr. Kerr to stay.

This year, however, under another governor and a different political climate in California, Dr. Kerr's enemies on the state board, the conservatives, made their feelings dramatically known.

Gov. Ronald Reagan, who since his election has been at odds with Dr. Kerr for insisting on budgetary cuts and student tuition, has won an important victory. His prestige has been enhanced and his power with the regents has been underlined.

But the governor's victory, if it can be called that at all, is a short-term one. Higher education in California will suffer because of his, and the board of regents, shortsightedness.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include pertinent material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress authorized \$1.75 billion for fiscal year 1967 for the Office of Economic Opportunity to fight the war against poverty.

It was clear at the time that this authorization was not sufficient to meet our needs. However, under the authorization-appropriation process which the House follows, the authorization was cut before the House adjourned last October by \$137.5 million, and the Office of Economic Opportunity wound up with \$1,612,500,000.

Instead of continuing ongoing programs or starting new ones, there had to be cutbacks. To say that the poor of this Nation were disappointed is an understatement.

Today I have introduced a supplemental appropriation bill to restore the lost \$137.5 million for fiscal year 1967.

The failure to live up to the commitments made in the authorization bill through the loss of this money is nothing short of an American tragedy. Unless

Congress restores the cut, we will be guilty of reneging on our promises to the poor. This will result in increasing the cynicism which already exists concerning the promise of the Great Society.

The wealthiest nation in the world cannot afford to cut any deeper into the antipoverty program. It is up to Congress to fulfill the commitment to eradicate poverty in an affluent America.

SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced legislation providing for automatic social security increases in the future whenever the cost of living increases 3 percent or more, and for an across-the-board increase of 8 percent in social security benefits.

It has been apparent for some time that the inflation we have been experiencing has worked a severe hardship and burden on our citizens, who depend on social security benefits, and who have tried to secure their own future. Last Congress, as a member of the Republican task force on aging, I introduced legislation to provide automatic increases in benefits commensurate with increases in the consumer price index. If my bill had been enacted into law during the 89th Congress, the recipients of social security would have already benefited from a comparable increase.

Since the effective date of the 1965 increase, the consumer price index has increased 5.3 percent. If the social security laws had contained an escalator provision, such as I am now proposing, this hardship would not have been imposed upon our senior citizens.

However, despite the continued erosion of social security benefits, and other savings by inflation, the administration did not feel that any action was necessary. If the administration's sense of concern matched the urgency of its political rhetoric, social security beneficiaries would currently be receiving increased benefits. Fairness to our elderly citizens requires that Congress act on this proposal as one of the first orders of business.

This provision for automatic increases, in the future, is identical to the bill I introduced in the last Congress, and is patterned after similar provisions in the civil service and military retirement laws.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will help compensate for the failure of benefit increases to keep up with increases in the cost of living, or the corollary thereof; namely, decreased purchasing power of the dollar. But equally, and perhaps even more important, it will insure prompt adjustment of benefits to living costs in the future. It will do this with an automatic trigger that will help take politics out of social security, and thus insure the adequacy of the trust fund for

present-day workers when they reach retirement age.

The administration must bear the responsibility for the plight of our older citizens during the last few inflationary years. While inflation has robbed them of a decent standard of living, the administration prevented a benefit increase by insisting that any increase be delayed until the medicare program could be enacted. If the social security laws had contained an escalator provision such as I am now proposing, this delay could have been avoided.

Based on information and the latest actuarial estimates from the Office of the Chief of Actuary of the Social Security Administration, an 8-percent increase in benefits can be enacted with absolutely no increase in social security taxes, or erosion of existing trust funds.

Mr. Speaker, three other areas of social security structural reform, I feel, that should be carefully examined by the Committee on Ways and Means are raising the minimum benefit, raising the present earnings limitation, and increasing the widows' benefit rate to 100 percent of primary. However, since each of these three proposals would require additional financing, either an increase in the tax rate or the tax base, or both, I think the Committee on Ways and Means should hold hearings and determine the cost as well as the priorities that should be accorded.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the two provisions of this bill, the automatic cost-of-living increases and the 8-percent increase in benefits, are a responsibly progressive answer to the various alternatives proposed in this field. It provides for increased benefits, while not increasing the tax burden upon our gainfully employed citizens, and establishes machinery whereby future benefits will be taken out of the hands of partisan politics.

BRAND-EX

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Great Society's ringmasters have decreed that the American people should have a 6-percent surtax, a permanent and sizable increase in social security tax payments, and a jump in the postage rate. Yet, this is the same Johnson-Humphrey administration that will, sometime this year, solemnly assure everyone that it is working very hard to keep down the cost of living.

It was this same administration that admonished housewives to put on their glasses and examine their shopping lists closely. Every taxpayer should put on his or her glasses and take a close look at the fiscal ballooning of the Federal budget for 1968.

If there were standards for labeling and packaging the budget, this one would never pass inspection. While we are at war, the Federal budget is obese and out

of shape. While the taxpayer is called on to sacrifice, Federal agencies are asking for more money to spend for their pet projects and programs.

The L.B.J. supermarket will never qualify as a discount house. The surtax is going to become a sore-tax for hard-pressed taxpayers, and I would venture to say that those who support this superfluous raid on the family finances will be known as "brand-ex" after the taxpayers go to the polls in 1968.

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 113.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 113

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives such sums as may be necessary to pay the compensation for services performed during the period beginning January 3, 1967, and ending at the close of February 28, 1967, by each person (1) who, on January 2, 1967, was employed by a standing committee or any select committee of the Eighty-ninth Congress and whose salary was paid under authority of a House resolution adopted during the Eighty-ninth Congress, and (2) who is certified by the chairman of the appropriate committee as performing such services for such committee during such period. Such compensation shall be paid such person at a rate not to exceed the rate he was receiving on January 2, 1967.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTEND MEDICARE TO WIDOWS WITH UNDERAGED CHILDREN

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has proposed a 20-percent increase in social security benefits to the Nation's senior citizens.

I firmly support this proposal for there is no question in my mind that we must increase monthly benefits to our senior citizens if they are to meet the increased cost of living.

However, I believe that in discussing the President's amendments, the time has come when we should extend hospital care under medicare to widows with underage children so that this entire program will become more acceptable to the younger worker who will have to carry the brunt of additional contributions to social security which in turn will make possible the President's proposal to increase by 20 percent benefits to senior citizens.

We cannot be unmindful of the fact that present wage earners who must carry the full brunt of providing increased benefits to senior citizens are becoming more and more concerned with mounting monthly contributions they must make to social security.

I believe the younger worker would be more willing to absorb higher social security premiums if he knew that under these increased premiums, he would be guaranteeing decent hospital care under medicare for his wife and children should he die before his children become of age.

If we now pay a widow with underaged children a pension, it appears to me that a breadwinner would find greater peace of mind if he knew that should something happen to him, his wife and children would not have to stand in line in a county hospital when they need medical attention, but rather could obtain such attention from their family doctor in a hospital of their choice under medicare. Please keep in mind that most group insurance plans lapse when the worker dies or leaves his employer.

I should like to remind my colleagues that the original medicare bill, sponsored by Congressman Aime Forand in 1958, included widows with underaged children for hospital care under social security.

This proviso was dropped as a concession to opponents of medicare. In my judgment it was a mistake to drop them from coverage then, and it is a greater mistake to exclude them from medicare now.

There are an estimated 2.5 million widows and underaged children receiving a pension under social security at the present time. I know of no reason why these widows and their underage children should not receive the same hospital care that we provide other social security recipients. But I do know that such care for widows with children would provide great comfort to the young father who today is concerned about the future of his family should death claim him prematurely.

I sincerely believe that young married couples would view the entire social security program with greater acceptance if this amendment became part of the overall changes being proposed by President Johnson in this year's social security revision.

I have every reason to believe the increased cost for this extended coverage to widows with young children would be nominal.

It is my intention to suggest this proposal to the Ways and Means Committee when it begins hearings on the President's proposal.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 28)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Eco-

nomics Committee and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

A healthy and productive economy is a bulwark of freedom.

Around the world and here at home, our trials of strength, our works of peace, our quest for justice, our search for knowledge and understanding, our efforts to enrich our environment are buttressed by an amazing productive power.

Americans have confronted many challenges in this century. The ones we face in 1967 are as trying of men's spirits as any we have known. But the overwhelming majority of us face our challenges in comfort, if not affluence. The sacrifices required of most of today's generation are not of income or security; rather we are called on to renounce prejudice, impatience, apathy, weakness, and weariness.

In purely material terms, most Americans are better off than ever before. That fact expands our responsibilities, as it enlarges our resources to meet them.

RECENT ECONOMIC GAINS

An average of 74 million persons were at work in 1966—2 million more than in 1965. Nonfarm payrolls averaged 64 million, a gain of 3 million. On the whole, these jobs were better paying than ever, and more regular and more secure than most workers can remember.

The value of our total production of goods and services in 1966 was \$740 billion—\$58 billion, or 8½ percent, higher than in 1965. More of the increase than we wanted represented higher prices. Still, the gain was nearly 5½ percent after correction for price changes.

Labor, business, and the farmer all contributed to this major gain in production, and they rightly shared the benefits.

Aggregate compensation of employees rose 10.3 percent. Average compensation per man-hour in the private economy rose 6.5 percent, reflecting increased wages and fringe benefits, more overtime, the shift to higher paying jobs, and increased employer contributions to social security. Corporate profits after taxes advanced more than 8 percent; per dollar of sales they were roughly unchanged from the high rate of 1965. Net income per farm rose more than 10 percent.

The single most meaningful measure of economic well-being is real disposable income per person—the after-tax purchasing power in stable dollars, available on the average to every man, woman, and child. It rose 3½ percent or \$89 per person in 1966. Although this advance was somewhat smaller than in 1965, it was still three times as large as the average yearly gain in the 1950's.

February 1961 launched the strongest and most durable economic expansion in our economic annals, and it still continues.

Almost 9 million jobs have been added in the last 6 years.

The rate of unemployment has fallen from 7 percent in early 1961 to under 4 percent. The rate for white adult males fell from 5 percent to 2 percent; for Negro men, from nearly 12 percent to less than 5 percent.

Early in 1961, more than two-thirds of our major labor markets were "areas of substantial unemployment"; today only 8 of the 150 are so classified, and 66 have unemployment below 3 percent.

While total population rose 11 million between 1961 and 1965, the number of Americans in poverty declined $5\frac{1}{2}$ million, and probably fell at least another $1\frac{1}{4}$ million in 1966. The poverty definition is adjusted for the increase in living costs.

Our gross national product—GNP—has grown 50 percent in 6 years. In constant prices, the gain has averaged $5\frac{1}{2}$ percent a year. The physical output of our factories and mines is up over 50 percent.

Private output per man-hour in 1966 was 19 percent higher than in 1961.

The 6-year addition to our gross stock of private productive capital—machines, buildings, transportation equipment, land improvements, and inventories—is valued at \$220 billion.

American families have added \$470 billion to their accumulated financial assets. They have added \$150 billion to their debts. So their net financial position is \$320 billion stronger than 6 years ago.

OUR ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Prosperity is everywhere evident. But prosperity is never without problems, and—in 1966—some of them were serious.

SOME LEADING PROBLEMS

1. Economic progress still left far too many behind.

Nearly 3 million workers were without jobs at the end of 1966. Perhaps two-thirds of them were "frictionally" unemployed: new entrants to the labor force in the process of locating a job; persons who quit one job to seek another; workers in the "off" months of seasonal industries; those temporarily laid off but with instructions to return. Their unemployment will be temporary; many were drawing unemployment insurance.

But most of the remaining third will wait a long time for a steady job. They are the "hard core" unemployed—lacking the necessary skills to find other than intermittent work; the victims of past or present discrimination; those unable or unwilling to move from depressed areas and occupations; the physically or emotionally handicapped.

Another half million to 1 million potential workers were not even counted as unemployed. Many had long ago abandoned any search for a job. Some had never tried.

But even among those who worked year round, some 2 million breadwinners—particularly the low skilled with large families—earned incomes insufficient to support a minimum standard of decent subsistence.

And $6\frac{1}{2}$ million families were poor because the heads of their households were unable to work: either aged, severely handicapped, or a widowed or deserted mother with young children.

Those left behind used to be called the "invisible poor." But an awakened public conscience has sharpened the vision of most Americans.

2. Price increases—although less than in many comparable periods—still were greater than we wanted or should long tolerate.

It is tempting to blame the creep of prices on the greed of producers—or the irresponsibility of labor—or Government policies—or bad weather—or economic disturbances abroad. Some of the price rise may have been due to each. But the main causes lay elsewhere:

Some can be traced to imbalances created by the special pressures of Vietnam procurement and booming private investment.

The spurt of demand—partly real, partly psychological—that followed the step-up of our Vietnam effort in mid-1965 simply exceeded the speed limits on the economy's ability to adjust. Our resources were sufficient for the task; but the sheer speed of the advance strained the ability of industrial management to mobilize resources at the required pace.

Some price advance was the inevitable cost of the adjustments required in recovering from a decade of slack:

Wages had to be raised sharply in underpaid occupations, which previously held their labor only because the alternative was no job at all.

Producers in once stagnant, low-profit industries saw opportunities for expansion and found it possible to raise prices and earnings in order to attract needed capital.

Demand pressed harder on skilled occupations and professional services where we had trained too few persons to meet the needs of a high employment economy.

Some price increases would still have occurred had we moved at a steadier pace.

But these price increases could have come slowly enough and have been small enough not to threaten a chain reaction of wages chasing other wages—wages chasing prices—prices chasing wages—and prices chasing other prices.

It is this spiral we must and can avoid. But it will require responsible action on the part of all.

3. Achieving equilibrium in our balance of payments remained a problem, in spite of strong new measures.

The costs of Vietnam required us to spend many more hundreds of millions of dollars beyond our shores. At the same time, the spurt of demand caused our imports—especially of capital goods—to soar.

We are determined to continue our progress toward equilibrium.

4. Tight money and high interest rates concentrated the burden of restraint on housing.

Interest rates in 1966 were as high as at any time in 40 years. They were pushed there by an insatiable demand for credit, straining against a deliberately restricted supply. Monetary policy in 1966—like tax policy—was properly aimed at slowing down an economy expanding too fast.

The brakes applied last year worked. But tight money worked painfully and inequitably. It cut construction by more than \$8 billion during 1966. Its impact was equivalent to a heavy across-the-board tax increase, but with most of its effect concentrated on a single industry.

FINDING SOLUTIONS

We will move this year toward solutions for these problems and others. But

they cannot all be completely solved in 1967.

LIFTING THE BURDEN ON HOUSING

Now that the economy's advance is again more moderate, the burden of tight money is being lifted. Interest rates are still extremely high—but they are moving down from their peaks. Credit is still not readily available to all who can make sound and productive use of it—but it is becoming easier to get. More savings are flowing into our thrift institutions and are beginning to be available to builders and homebuyers.

The steps we took last year and those I am now proposing, the steps the Federal Reserve has recently taken and is continuing to take to increase credit availability and lower interest rates, should have our housing industry moving smartly forward by the end of 1967, and ready for one of its best years in 1968.

RESTORING PRICE STABILITY

The advance of prices has already begun to slow. Wholesale prices in December were below their levels of August.

The more moderate pace of economic advance now underway, which the policies I am recommending are designed to maintain, should further diminish inflationary pressures.

We cannot rescind all of last year's increases in costs, some of which are still spreading through our structure of prices. Price stability cannot be restored overnight. But we will be making good progress toward price stability this year.

IMPROVING OUR INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS

We have recently announced stronger voluntary balance-of-payments programs for 1967. Our policies to constrain economic expansion to a sustainable pace should permit an improved export surplus.

I am now recommending further steps to strengthen our external payments. Yet so long as we remain heavily engaged in southeast Asia, we will have a balance-of-payments problem.

COMBATING POVERTY

We will continue to attack poverty and deprivation through such weapons as—Community action and Headstart;

Rent supplements and child nutrition; Aid to elementary and secondary education in poverty areas and the Teachers Corps;

The Manpower Development and Training Act, the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps;

Medicare, medicaid, and neighborhood health centers;

Measures to end discrimination in jobs, education, and public facilities;

The expanded coverage enacted last year for a higher minimum wage.

I am proposing that our attack be reinforced with new weapons in 1967.

Yet, with old weapons and new, the war on poverty will not be won in 1967—or 1968. There is no wonder drug which can suddenly conquer this ancient scourge of man. It will be a long and continuing struggle, which will challenge our imagination, our patience, our knowledge, and our resources for years to come. Our capacity to stay with the task will be a test of our maturity as a people.

USING THE GAINS OF GROWTH

From early 1961 to the end of 1966, our GNP rose an average of \$44 billion a year. About \$9 billion a year was price increase. Of the balance—

An average real gain of \$10 billion a year—in 1966 prices—came from putting idle men and machines back to work.

An average real gain of \$25 billion a year—in 1966 prices—came from the growth of our resources: a larger work force, more and better capital and management, higher productivity.

Further gains from putting idle resources to work will now be harder to achieve.

But our annual dividend from growth has meanwhile become more generous. In 1967 it will add \$30 billion at today's prices to our potential output.

Our economic policies must assure that we realize this potential dividend—and use it wisely.

REALIZING THE GROWTH DIVIDEND

To insure our full dividend from economic growth requires that markets for goods and services expand steadily and adequately—but not excessively. In recent years, we have tested and refined the power of fiscal and monetary policy to stimulate or moderate the expansion of total demand.

During 1966, Federal expenditures were expanding rapidly, but tax policy worked to counter their impact.

Federal expenditures in our national income accounts grew \$19 billion in calendar year 1966, reflecting the stepup in national defense; in social security, medicare, and related payments; and in grants to State and local governments. They added strongly to private purchasing power. They would have added more but for the substantial expenditure cutbacks put into effect during the year.

On the other side, taxes restrained demand. Higher payroll taxes, the restoration of some excise taxes, the institution of graduated withholding, and the suspension of tax incentives to investment all represented new measures that were draining off more than \$9 billion of spendable incomes by yearend. In combination, and for the full year, these measures and an expanding economy produced \$18 billion more in revenues than in 1965. Prompt action by Congress in response to my tax proposals of January and September made tax policy an important force for economic restraint.

Taking the two sides together, our national income accounts budget was in surplus in the first half and in balance for 1966 as a whole.

But as private investment threatened to outrun private saving, sharp monetary restraint was also applied. In response to both fiscal and monetary restraints, the economy shifted gears from excessive speed to a moderate advance.

FISCAL POLICY FOR 1967

In the year ahead we are determined to maintain that moderate advance; we need no further slowdown; we can tolerate no new spurt of demand. After midyear, the tax increase I have proposed and a more moderate growth of Federal spending will increase the freedom of monetary policy to support ex-

pansion. I am confident that the opportunity will be used.

The specific fiscal program I am recommending includes—

A surcharge of 6 percent on the tax liabilities of individuals, exempting persons in the lowest income brackets;

The same 6-percent surcharge on the tax liabilities of corporations.

Here are some examples of the effect of this proposal, as applied to a married couple with two dependents, using typical deductions:

With \$5,000 income, their tax will be unchanged—still \$130 lower than they would have paid in 1963.

With \$10,000 income, their tax in 1968 will rise \$67, or 1.30 a week. Their annual tax will still be \$190 less than they would have paid in 1963.

With \$20,000 income, their tax in 1968 will rise \$190, or \$3.65 a week. But their annual tax will still be \$450 less than they would have paid in 1963.

A corporation with profits before tax of \$100,000 will pay an extra \$2,490. It will still pay \$2,510 less than it would have paid in 1963.

One with profits of \$1,000,000 will pay an extra \$28,410, still \$12,590 less than it would have paid in 1963.

The surcharge will provide for \$5.1 billion of extra revenues in fiscal year 1968 on a national income accounts basis, substantially offsetting the expansion of \$5.8 billion in defense purchases.

The national income accounts budget will also be affected by my proposals for social security benefits and taxes.

After allowance for these changes, the national income accounts deficit for fiscal year 1968 is now estimated at \$2.1 billion, compared with \$3.8 billion in fiscal year 1967.

I am also recommending two further accelerations of corporate tax payments, to begin in 1968:

Requiring quarterly payment of estimated tax on the basis of 80 percent rather than 70 percent of liability;

Requiring, over a 5-year period, that small corporations, as well as large, become current in their tax payments, in the same way as individual proprietors.

We have fashioned a fiscal program for sustainable expansion. With that program, we now see a rise of about \$47 billion in our GNP in 1967—a growth dividend close to 4 percent in real terms.

USING THE GROWTH DIVIDEND

The first priority for the use of our growth dividend must, as always, be the defense of freedom. But it will take only a small part of our \$47 billion of added production.

These will be the public claims on our growth dividend:

Ten billion dollars more of our output in 1967 will go for the support of our men in Vietnam and other urgent needs of defense.

One and one-half billion dollars will go for the expansion of other Federal purchases, including adjustments in Federal civilian and military pay.

State and local governments will use about \$8 billion more of the Nation's resources in 1967. In this, they will be aided by Federal grants totaling nearly \$15 billion.

The remaining \$27½ billion of our

GNP gain in 1967—nearly 60 percent of it—will be used in the private sector. And the flow of goods and services to consumers will expand this year by even more than that.

In the past several years, an unusually large part of our output growth has gone to expand the productive capacity of business and to build up inventories to support high and growing production and sales. On balance, a slightly smaller portion of our resources will be used for these purposes in 1967 than in 1966.

For the year as a whole, slightly less of our resources than last year will be used to build new homes, although a sharp recovery in residential construction from its current deep recession is expected during the course of the year.

As the flow of goods and services to consumers expands, the ability of our elderly citizens to share in these gains will be supported by a rise of more than \$6 billion in social security and medicare payments.

In 1967, we will have no bonus dividend from using previously idle resources. But the dividend from growth alone is a big one. We must be sure we get it; and we must use it wisely.

RESTORING PRICE STABILITY

From the beginning of 1961 until 1965, the United States enjoyed both price stability and a strongly expanding economy. The average of wholesale prices hardly moved, and consumer prices rose only a little more than 1 percent a year. Last year, that record was blemished. Consumer prices rose 2.9 percent between 1965 and 1966, wholesale prices 3.2 percent.

When we were involved in Korea, consumer prices rose 8.0 percent between 1950 and 1951, wholesale prices 11.4 percent. And we had price controls during most of 1951.

Even when we were not at war, consumer prices rose 3.5 percent between 1956 and 1957, wholesale prices 2.9 percent.

Nevertheless, we are not satisfied with our record on prices. And we expect to improve on it this year.

There are many reasons why we refuse to tolerate rapidly rising prices:

They injure those with fixed incomes, especially older people.

They can lead to speculation and economic distortions which could undermine prosperity.

They weaken our competitive position in world markets.

As they persist, they become harder to stop without throwing the economy into reverse.

Restoring price stability is one of our major tasks. It will not be accomplished all at once, or all in 1967. That could be done—if at all—only at the cost of mass unemployment, idle machines, and intolerable economic waste. But a gradual return to stability can go hand in hand with steady economic advance.

Such an improvement will require—Prudent fiscal and monetary policies; Government efforts to help relieve the key points of pressure on prices;

The responsible conduct of those in business and labor who have the power to make price and wage decisions.

With steady, sustainable, and balanced growth, we can look forward to—

Relief of pressures on capacity in such strained areas as machinery and metals;

Adjustments of raw materials supplies to demand;

The end of labor shortages in key areas.

Other efforts of the Federal Government can help to relieve particular pressures on prices and wages. We will continue—

To develop manpower training programs to meet skill shortages;

To increase the efficiency of the employment services in matching jobs and men;

To handle Government procurement so as to minimize its pressure on prices;

To dispose of surplus Government stockpiles to alleviate shortages of raw materials;

To manage farm programs to assure adequate supplies as well as equitable returns.

But efforts of the Government alone will not be enough. The cooperation of business and labor is essential for success.

In the past year, most businessmen who had a choice in setting prices and most trade unions that negotiated wage contracts acted responsibly. They did so because they took account of the national interest and saw that it was also their own.

If business and labor were to consider only their own short-run interests—

Each union might seek a wage increase which exceeds the most recent settlement by some other union;

Each business might strive to achieve a new profit record by translating strong demand into higher prices, whether or not costs have increased.

But when business and labor consider the national interest—and their own longer run interests—they realize that such actions would have only one result: a wage-price spiral which is in the interest of neither.

If unions now attempt to recoup in wages all of the past or anticipated advance in the cost of living—in addition to the productivity trend;

If businesses now seek to pass along rising costs when it would be possible to absorb them or do not reduce prices when costs fall;

Then the result will be just such a spiral—damaging to business, damaging to labor, and disastrous to the Nation.

Once again, I appeal to business and labor—in their own interest and that of the Nation—for the utmost restraint and responsibility in wage and price decisions.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICIES

The current year is a critical one for our international economic policies and for the economic progress of the world community.

As the largest single market and source of capital, the United States carries special responsibilities.

TRADE

This administration is committed to reducing barriers to international trade, as demonstrated by my recent action terminating the 1954 escape clause action

on watches, and rolling back the special tariff on imports of glass.

The Kennedy round of trade negotiations is now entering its final and most critical phase. I emphasize once more how important this great attempt to liberalize world trade is for all the developed and developing nations of the free world.

After more than 4 years of discussion, it is essential that the participants now resolve the many complex problems that still remain. It would indeed be a tragedy if the wide authority granted to the President by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 were allowed to lapse unused. Never before has there been such a splendid opportunity to increase world trade. It must not be lost.

But the Kennedy round is not the end of the road. We must look beyond the negotiations in Geneva to further progress in the years ahead. We must begin to shape a trade policy for the next decade that is responsive to the needs of both the less developed and the advanced countries.

We should seize every opportunity to build and enlarge bridges of peaceful exchange with the countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. We should have the ability to adapt our policies to whatever political circumstances or commercial opportunities may present themselves. I again urge the Congress to provide authority to expand our trade relations with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

AID

Although 1966 was a relatively good year for world economic growth, average output in developing countries rose by less than \$3 a person.

There were, however, encouraging signs of progress. Developing nations demonstrated a willingness to take difficult but necessary steps to help themselves. India, for example, revised her foreign exchange and agricultural policies to promote more rapid growth.

Among the wealthier nations, stronger efforts were made to assist the development of the poorer countries. Canada and Japan increased their assistance programs. Major free world aid donors joined in new groups to coordinate their flow of aid.

The United States will continue to respond constructively to the aspirations of the developing nations. We will give first priority to fighting the evils of hunger, disease, and ignorance in those free world countries which are resolutely committed to helping themselves.

There should, however, be increasing efforts to make both the receiving and giving of aid a matter for creative international partnership. We shall therefore—

Continue to support enthusiastically, in a manner consistent with our balance-of-payments position, such promising cooperative regional efforts as the Alliance for Progress, the Inter-American, the Asian, and the African Development Banks, and the Mekong Development Fund of the United Nations;

Further encourage the coordinated extension and expansion of aid by the major donor countries in ways that result in an equitable sharing of the burden; and

Seek the cooperation of other major donor countries this year in replenishing the resources of the International Development Association.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

We can take some satisfaction in the fact that our balance of payments in 1966 may prove to have been in surplus on official reserve settlements. Despite the added costs of the war in Vietnam and the rapid growth of imports, our deficit on a liquidity basis increased only slightly in 1966.

But we cannot relax our efforts to seek further improvement.

Our goal in the coming year is to continue to move toward balance-of-payments equilibrium as rapidly as the foreign exchange costs of the Vietnam conflict may permit. This goal will be supported through measures and policies consistent with healthy growth at home and our responsibilities abroad.

We already have extended and reinforced the voluntary restraint programs for corporate investment abroad and for foreign lending by financial institutions. I am counting on the continued full cooperation of businesses and banks with these programs in 1967. And I have instructed all agencies of the Government to intensify their efforts to limit the dollar drain resulting from their activities.

But more is needed. I now recommend the following steps:

1. The Congress should extend the interest equalization tax, in strengthened form, to July 31, 1969. This tax has proved extremely useful in limiting the borrowing of developed countries in our capital markets and in reinforcing the Federal Reserve voluntary program. As we move toward easier money in the United States, foreign borrowing in our financial markets may tend to increase. I am therefore requesting authority to adjust the rates of the interest equalization tax as monetary conditions warrant, so that the effective impact on interest costs can be varied between zero and 2 percent. This would replace the present flat 1-percent impact.

Moreover, to insure against possible anticipatory increases in foreign borrowing, I am also requesting that the tax be imposed at rates which provide an impact of 2 percent on interest costs while the legislation is under consideration by Congress.

2. The most satisfactory way to arrest the increasing gap between American travel abroad and foreign travel here is not to limit the former but to stimulate and encourage the latter. I shall appoint in the near future a special industry-Government task force to make specific recommendations by May 1, 1967, on how the Federal Government can best stimulate foreign travel to the United States. After a careful review of their advice, I shall ask the U.S. Travel Service and other appropriate agencies to take the steps that seem most promising.

3. As part of our longrun balance-of-payments program, I shall also—

Request continuation and expansion by \$4.5 billion of the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank in order to support the expansion of exports;

Continue to urge other countries to participate in the development of better means both of sharing the resource burdens and of neutralizing the balance-of-payments effect arising from the common defense and foreign assistance efforts.

4. For the longer run strength of our payments balance, we should intensify efforts to—

Stimulate exporters' interest in supplying foreign markets;

Enlist the support of the financial community to attract additional foreign investment in the United States;

Encourage further development of foreign capital markets.

IMPROVING THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SYSTEM

In 1966, significant progress was made toward a better international monetary system. Through close consultation and cooperation among the financial authorities of major countries, temporary strains were met promptly and effectively.

Two large forward steps were taken on the road to international monetary reform: wide consensus was reached on basic principles for the deliberate creation of additional reserve assets; and the negotiations advanced to a second stage in which all members of the International Monetary Fund are participating.

An even greater effort must be made in the coming year to improve our monetary system. In particular, I urge that—

All countries participate in the continuing task of strengthening the basic monetary arrangements that have served the world so well;

Both surplus and deficit countries assume their full responsibility for proper adjustment of international payments imbalances, and cooperate in efforts to lower world interest rates;

Full agreement be reached on a constructive contingency plan for the adequate and orderly growth of world monetary reserves.

HELPING THE DISADVANTAGED

The United States is the first large nation in the history of the world wealthy enough to end poverty within its borders. There are many fronts in the war on poverty. We are moving forward on them all.

There must be full employment so that those qualified and able to work can find jobs. The unemployment rate last year was the lowest in 13 years.

Those not now fully qualified must be given the education and training, the health and guidance services which will enable them to make their full contribution to society. We have greatly increased our aid to education and enlarged our training programs, and we will expand them further.

For those who will be unable to earn adequate incomes, there must be help—most of all for the benefit of children, whose misfortune to be born poor must not deprive them of future opportunity. We have increased our income support, and we will increase it further.

Wherever the poor and disadvantaged are concentrated, intensive and co-

ordinated programs to break the cycle of deprivation and dependency must continue and be reinforced. We have instituted these programs in hundreds of cities and rural areas; we are expanding them and designing others.

INCOME GUARANTEES

Completely new proposals for guaranteeing minimum incomes are now under discussion. They range from a "negative income tax" to a complete restructuring of public assistance to a program of residual public employment for all who lack private jobs. Their advocates include some of the sturdiest defenders of free enterprise. These plans may or may not prove to be practicable at any time. And they are almost surely beyond our means at this time. But we must examine any plan, however unconventional, which could promise a major advance. I intend to establish a commission of leading Americans to examine the many proposals that have been put forward, reviewing their merits and disadvantages, and reporting in 2 years to me and the American people.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Our system of public assistance is now 30 years old and has obvious faults. The standards of need set by many States are unrealistically low; benefits are further restricted by excessively stringent eligibility conditions. In some respects the system perpetuates dependency.

1. State standards of need are miserably low. In 18 States a family of 4 is presumed able to manage for a month on \$45 a person—or less. And in many States, actual payments average far below their own standards of need.

It is time to raise payments toward more acceptable levels.

As a first step, I ask the Congress to require that each State's payments at least meet its own definition of need; and that its definition should be kept up to date annually as conditions change.

2. With minor exceptions, payments under public assistance are reduced dollar for dollar of earnings by the recipient, removing any incentive to accept part-time work. We should encourage self-help, not penalize it.

It is time to put an end to this 100 percent tax on the earnings of those on public assistance.

I shall therefore ask Congress to enact payment formulas which will permit those on assistance to keep some part of what they may earn, without loss of payments.

3. Many recipients of public assistance are capable of receiving training which would ultimately make them self-supporting.

I therefore urge the Congress to make permanent the unemployed parent and community work and training programs associated with aid to families with dependent children—AFDC—and to require all States receiving Federal support under AFDC to cooperate in making community work and training available for the unemployed parents of dependent children.

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT

The coexistence of job vacancies and idle workers unable to fill them repre-

sents a bitter human tragedy and an inexcusable economic waste. One of society's most creative acts is the training of the unemployed, the underemployed, or the formerly unemployable to fill those vacancies.

A dynamic economy demands new and changing skills. By enabling workers to acquire those skills, we open opportunities for individual development and self-fulfillment. And we make possible higher production without inflationary pressures.

I shall ask the Congress for funds to support a new and special effort to train and find jobs for the disadvantaged who live in urban ghettos.

I shall also propose legislation to improve the effectiveness of the Federal-State employment service.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Millions of aged still live in poverty. Millions of younger Americans are willing to pay for more adequate retirement benefits in the future.

I ask the Congress to approve an overall 20-percent increase in our social security program. We can increase benefits for all social security beneficiaries by at least 15 percent, raise the minimum benefit by 59 percent to \$70 a month, assure workers with 25 years of coverage at least \$100 a month, extend medical insurance to disabled beneficiaries, and allow larger earnings without loss of benefits.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Our system of unemployment insurance was created in a world of massive unemployment. The needs of a high employment economy are different. Today, when jobs are available, the jobless who exhaust their benefits typically need training, guidance, or other supportive services.

Therefore, I am asking the Congress to consider legislation to provide such services in conjunction with extended benefits to the long-term unemployed, to extend the protection of the system to additional workers, to establish more uniformly adequate benefits, and to correct abuses.

CITIES AND HOUSING

The American city is not obsolete; it is still a great engine for economic and social progress. But cities are in trouble, threatened by congestion, pollution, crime, poverty, racial tension, slums, and blight.

Yesterday's rural poor have been moving to the city just as many of the jobs they seek and need have been moving to the suburbs. Inadequate transportation and discrimination in housing make it difficult for them to follow the jobs; and deficiencies of education, health, and skills compound their disadvantages.

Most cities cannot afford the massive expenditures necessary to solve these problems. The flight of higher income families and businesses to the suburbs erodes sources of revenue for the cities, even as expenditure demands escalate. Inflexible city limits have created a hodgepodge of local taxing jurisdictions, often dividing the tax base from the need. The cities cannot collect for the many benefits they supply to residents of the suburbs.

The problems of the cities flow across irrelevant boundaries established by historical accident. So solutions must draw on the resources and imagination of a larger area. Our efforts have been aimed to encourage a metropolitan approach to metropolitan problems.

We must also find ways to enlist more fully the resources and imagination of private enterprise in the great task of restoring our cities.

I have just appointed a commission, under the chairmanship of Senator Paul H. Douglas, to work with the Department of Housing and Urban Development to examine problems of codes, zoning, taxation, and development standards and to recommend ways to increase the supply of low-cost housing. I am convinced that this study can make a major contribution to the solution of urban problems.

Last year, the Congress enacted the pathbreaking model cities legislation. The Federal Government will help cities to focus all available programs on their needs—eventually to overwhelm the problems that have heretofore overwhelmed the cities.

More than 70 cities will have completed their plans and be eligible to start receiving assistance in 1968. Federal aid for water and sewer projects, open land conservation, and urban mass transportation is encouraging a more coordinated approach to metropolitan problems. I seek increased appropriations for all of these programs. And I shall seek authorization and resources for a greatly expanded program of research on urban problems.

Growth in the number and incomes of American families will require us to build about 2 million new houses a year for the next decade, most of them in and around cities. Last year, housing bore a disproportionate part of the burden of needed restraint. But we are now moving into a period of renewed homebuilding. I look for construction to rise briskly during 1967.

Federal programs for fiscal 1968 will assist in construction or renovation of 165,000 housing units for the urban poor, the elderly, and the handicapped. The rent supplement program will contribute to this goal.

This year will be a brightening one for the housing industry; it can also be a landmark year in the progress and evolution of our cities.

EDUCATION AND HEALTH

Individually and collectively, Americans have insatiable appetites for more education and better health. Education and health contribute both to individual well-being and to the Nation's productivity. But far too many of our urban and rural poor are denied adequate access to either. The efficiency of our methods of education and of providing medical care can and should be strengthened.

History will record these years as the time when this Nation awoke to its needs—and its limitations—in education and health. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Headstart, the Teachers Corps, medicare, medicaid, and the partnership in health will be landmarks in our social economic development.

I shall propose—

An expanded Headstart program; a follow-through program in the early years of school; and the opening of other new educational opportunities for children;

Both legislative and administrative changes to accelerate research and development on more efficient and effective ways of providing health resources;

An expanded child health program, including early diagnosis and treatment, a pilot program of dental care, and the training of additional health personnel to provide services to children.

ABATING POLLUTION

A polluted environment erodes our health and well-being. It diminishes individual vitality; it is costly to industry and agriculture; it has debilitating effects on urban and regional development; it takes some of the joy out of life.

The 89th Congress enacted important legislation to improve the quality of our environment. All 50 States have now signified their intention to establish water quality standards for their interstate and coastal waters. The Federal Government is assisting State and local governments through comprehensive water basin planning, and is providing financial help to States for the administration of water pollution control and to local areas for the construction of sewage treatment facilities. In addition, we are studying appropriate methods to encourage industry to control its discharge of pollutants.

The foundation for abating air pollution was laid in the Clean Air Act of 1965. But the air over every city proves that further steps are necessary.

I propose that we get on with the jobs of preserving and restoring our environment. I will present detailed proposals on control of air pollution in another message.

IMPROVING OUR TAX SYSTEM

Our tax system is one in which we can take pride. In terms of fairness, revenue productivity, and balanced economic impact, it is unsurpassed by any other tax system in the world today.

Nevertheless, it can be improved. As they now stand, our tax laws impose undue burdens on some and grant unfair benefits to others.

A system as complex as ours cannot be perfected in a single bill. Rather, the process of tax reform must be continuous, with every provision of the law subject to constant examination and adjustment where needed. Moreover, this work of basic reform should proceed independently of the requirements for raising taxes or the opportunities for tax reduction.

I therefore plan to submit proposals to the Congress to improve the equity of our tax system and reduce economic distortions. These proposals will be designed to avoid significant budgetary effects.

As one specific reform, I will urge changes to deal with abuses by tax-exempt private foundations.

IMPROVING GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

Separate Departments of Labor and Commerce perpetuate the obsolete notion that there is fundamental conflict between the interests of business and

labor, or between the interests of either and that of the Nation.

A single department of labor and business can more effectively carry out those national programs which affect the private productive sector as a whole. The two departments share many common objectives; their interests and activities coincide or overlap in—

Fostering economic and regional development;

Matching the skills of labor with the needs of employers;

Providing more jobs at better wages; Avoiding labor disputes;

Maintaining a fair distribution of private incomes without inflation;

Providing stability of production and jobs;

Providing basic economic and social information and technical services needed by both private and public sectors;

Supporting expansion of international trade and considering its impact on the domestic economy.

By combining these activities, we can greatly improve efficiency, reduce costs, simplify the reporting burden on business, provide better and more uniform statistics, and assure that the views and the problems of the private sector enter more effectively into decisions on general economic policy.

I urge the Congress to support my recommendation for a new department of labor and business.

OTHER ECONOMIC POLICIES

1. I renew four recommendations made in my Economic Report of 1966 and not acted upon by the 89th Congress:

A fair system of charges for users of highways, aviation facilities, and inland waterways, to improve efficiency in the use of transportation resources, and to reimburse the Federal Government for a part of its expenditures on facilities which directly benefit those who use them;

Truth-in-lending legislation, to provide consumers with a full and clear statement of the true cost of credit;

Stronger regulation of savings and loan holding companies;

Provision of Federal charters for mutual savings banks, to enlarge and strengthen our system of thrift institutions.

2. To aid the advance of technology on which economic progress depends, I now urge congressional support for—

A long-overdue modernization of our patent system;

A large-scale program of research in transportation.

3. Total holdings in the Nation's stockpile of strategic and critical materials now stand at \$6.5 billion. Of this amount, \$3.4 billion are excess to our defense needs as presently determined.

During the last fiscal year, the Administrator of General Services disposed of excess stockpile materials valued at slightly more than \$1 billion without disruption of the domestic economy or the normal channels of trade.

The last session of the Congress authorized disposal of excess stockpile material valued at \$782 million. I will ask the Congress for authority to dispose

of additional stockpile excesses, bringing to about \$2 billion the present value of excess stockpile material available for disposal.

I believe that we should relieve taxpayers of the burden of carrying unneeded surplus stocks, and provide businesses and workers with the materials necessary to assure continued high levels of production.

4. The responsibility which we share with the States to ensure that our banks and thrift institutions are honest, competent, and competitive is a continuing function demanding constant attention. We must continue to encourage the orderly and progressive development of a financial system adequate to meet the needs of a growing and dynamic economy.

I urge the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to continue and to intensify their efforts to coordinate their regulatory policies and procedures, and to improve their examination methods.

AFTER VIETNAM

Despite all our efforts for an honorable peace in Vietnam, the war continues. I cannot predict when it will end. Thus our plans must assume its long duration.

But peace will return—and it could return sooner than we dare expect.

When hostilities do end, we will be faced with a great opportunity, and a challenge how best to use that opportunity. The resources now being claimed by the war can be diverted to peaceful uses both at home and abroad, and can hasten the attainment of the great goals upon which we have set our sights.

If we keep our eyes firmly fixed on those goals—and if we plan wisely—we need have no fear that the bridge from war to peace will exact a wasteful toll of idle resources, human or material.

But when that welcome day of peace arrives, we will need quick adjustments in our economic policies. We must be prepared for those adjustments, ready to act rapidly—both to avoid interruption to our prosperity and to take full and immediate advantage of our opportunities.

Planning for peace has been an important activity in many executive agencies. But the effort needs to be stepped up and integrated.

Accordingly, I am instructing the heads of the relevant agencies in the executive branch, under the leadership of the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, to begin at once a major and coordinated effort to review our readiness. I have asked them—

To consider possibilities and priorities for tax reduction;

To prepare, with the Federal Reserve Board, plans for quick adjustments of monetary and financial policies;

To determine which high priority programs can be quickly expanded;

To determine priorities for the longer range expansion of programs to meet the needs of the American people, both through new and existing programs;

To study and evaluate the future direction of Federal financial support to our States and local governments;

To examine ways in which the transition to peace can be smoothed for the workers, companies, and communities now engaged in supplying our defense needs, and the men released from our Armed Forces.

I have directed that initial reports be prepared on all of these and related problems, and that thereafter they be kept continuously up to date.

CONCLUSION

Our task for 1967 is to sustain further sound and rewarding economic progress while we move toward solutions for the problems we met in 1966. It will require a flexible and delicate balance of economic policies.

Above all, we must guard against any interruption of our prosperity. The steady advance of jobs and incomes is our most powerful weapon in the battle against poverty and discrimination at home. And it undergirds our policy around the world.

Yet we must be equally alert to the dangers of inflation.

In his Economic Report of January 1956, President Eisenhower wrote:

The continuance of general prosperity cannot be taken for granted. In a high-level economy like ours, neither the threat of inflation nor the threat of recession can ever be very distant. . . . The only rigid rule we can afford to admit to our minds is the principle that the best way to fight a recession is to try to prevent it from occurring.

Only 18 months later, the sharpest recession of the entire postwar period began—which also led to the largest peacetime budget deficit in our history. Over the same 18 months, both consumer prices and wholesale prices advanced 5½ percent—considerably faster than in the 18 months since June 1965.

That history does not invalidate but rather reinforces President Eisenhower's proposition. Neither the threat of inflation nor of recession is ever distant in a high-level economy.

How can we steer between these dangers, and—at the same time—supply the needs of national defense, strengthen our overseas payments, relieve the inequities of tight money and high interest rates, maintain the momentum of social progress, and provide the growth of incomes which lets each of us move toward fulfilling his private aspirations?

I am confident that we can find such a course. We will continue to coordinate the tools of monetary and fiscal policy to the common goal—the sound, balanced, and noninflationary advance of production and incomes. We are steering toward lower interest rates, a better balance in our economy, a budget and a social security program that reflect national priorities.

There will be surprises in store along the way. We must be prepared to meet them swiftly and flexibly. And I think we are. The tools of economic policy are not perfect; but they are far better understood and accepted—in the Government and in the private community—than ever before.

We have surely proved over recent years that economic progress does not need to be interrupted by frequent recessions. And, although prices have

risen faster in the past year and a half than we expected or wished, we have done better than in most similar periods of our economic history. And we have done it without burdensome controls on prices or wages.

The Federal Government cannot do the whole job—or even very much of it. Production and incomes arise from the strength and skill of workers, the ingenuity of managements, the willingness of savers to risk their capital, the genius of inventors and engineers, the patience of teachers, the devotion of local public servants—the contributions of all who participate in our economy.

Yet the Federal Government has a role of leadership and a responsibility for coordination.

The Congress defined that role in the Employment Act of 1946:

It is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government . . . with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all of its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare . . . useful employment opportunities . . . for those able, willing and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

Our economic policies for 1967 respond to that mandate.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 26, 1967.

PRICES IN 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the President for his balanced and constructive report on the state of the economy.

At a time when our attention is focused on the year ahead, the President's report performs a valuable service by placing 1967 in perspective and by reminding us of how far we have come since the dark days of February 1961. We have reached the administration's first-stage target of less than 4 percent unemployment; we have added nearly 9 million jobs; we have significantly lowered the number of those living in poverty; and we have experienced an amazing growth rate of 5½ percent a year.

President Johnson nevertheless has not glossed over the very real problems which still confront the economy—and this Congress—in 1967. In particular, he recognizes the concern of all Americans over the price increases of the past year and the threat of continued increases this year. As he notes, much of the recent price increase can largely be traced to the spurt of demand beginning in mid-1965, as we stepped up our effort in Vietnam and as private investment continued to boom. Although the resulting price increases were less than in other comparable periods, such as the

Korean war, they present a clear warning that firm policies are needed in 1967 to assure improvement.

To meet the problem of inflation, the President has proposed a prudent mixture of policies. In addition, the President has wisely pointed out the need to improve the efficiency of our labor markets in matching jobs and men. We have now reached the critical point beyond which unemployment cannot be easily reduced by expanding demand, for such a course would produce a sharp rise in prices. We must instead place even more emphasis on training the hard-core unemployed and on bringing qualified workers and suitable vacancies together more quickly and at less cost to everyone concerned.

These measures will move us in the right direction. But they will not reduce or eliminate all inflationary pressures overnight. We must recognize that only a severe recession could entirely halt or reverse the recent price increases, and that a balanced growth of the economy in the year ahead will undoubtedly be accompanied by some price increases. It, therefore, becomes all the more important that business and labor respond to the President's call for restraint in their decisions on wages and prices. His report realistically acknowledges the pressures placed upon workers and employers by the recent rise in prices—but it also points forcefully to the dangers of a wage-price spiral, if both parties now attempt to recoup all of the past or anticipated advance in prices.

The year ahead will not be an easy one on the economic front, but the President has charted a course which deserves the support of this Congress and the country at large.

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC MESSAGE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the errors and omissions of economic policy in 1966 are now coming back to haunt the administration. It is evident from the 1967 Economic Report that there is no easy way out of the economic problems created by the administration's mismanagement of the economy last year.

The dilemmas which face the administration this year have produced curious and potentially dangerous contradictions in the President's proposals.

First, the administration admits that inflation, particularly from the cost side, will continue to be a serious problem, with no early or simple solution in sight. In spite of this expression of concern, it has proposed a sharp increase in spending that will result in substantial budget deficits that will, without question, exert additional inflationary pressures throughout the year. Even more to the point is the strong likelihood that current spending estimates will prove too

low and revenue estimates too high, resulting in deficits substantially greater than those now predicted. Furthermore, the administration is proposing increases in personal and corporate income taxes, as well as new social security taxes which, in the final analysis, may themselves cause an upward push on business costs and prices.

Second, the administration foresees a slowdown in growth in the first half of the current year, and a speedup in growth in the second half. This forecast is almost directly the opposite of that now being made by most private economists. There is a strong chance that the rate of economic advance will fall in the second half of the year, when the investment tax credit will really begin to bite into business spending for plant and equipment. Under these circumstances, the administration's proposal for an increase in corporate and personal taxes to take effect July 1 cannot be supported on economic grounds at this time.

Third, the administration believes that interest rates should be lowered in order to correct the distortions and imbalances which arose from its high-interest-rate policy of last year. Yet based on conservative estimates, it proposes \$9.4 billion in regular Treasury borrowing, net agency borrowing, and participation sales. The result of these Federal activities in the financial markets will make it difficult, perhaps impossible, to lower interest rates.

Fourth, the balance of payments is likely to suffer further deterioration next year. The administration's goal to lower interest rates, while desirable on domestic grounds, poses the risk of a massive outflow of funds that could create a balance-of-payments deficit of crisis proportions.

The Joint Economic Committee, in its annual hearings next month, will want to give careful consideration to these and other apparent contradictions in the administration's economic proposals. Unless policies this year are carefully tailored for their economic, as opposed to their political impact, the Nation is likely to face an economy market by more serious inflation, substantially slower growth—possibly even a recession—and a sharp worsening in the balance-of-payments position.

COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE RECORDING STUDIO

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 105(c), Public Law 624, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the House Recording Studio the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. STEED, of Oklahoma.
Mr. IRWIN, of Connecticut.
Mr. DEVINE, of Ohio.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 182) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 182

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That during the remainder of the Ninetieth Congress the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall be composed of thirty-four members.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND THE WEEK OF JANUARY 30, 1967

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the schedule for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Upon finishing the business for today, we will have finished the business for the week, and it will be our purpose to ask to go over to Monday.

As the gentleman knows, we are just now finishing the constitution of the committees, and there will be no legislative business of any great importance next week. So we do not intend to send out notices to Members.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO JANUARY 30, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of Calendar Wednesday on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SEPARATION OF EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, on January 2, 1947, under the Legislative

Reorganization Act of 1946, two large subject areas—the area of education and that of labor—were joined together in the House of Representatives under one committee, the Committee on Education and Labor.

There was at that time perhaps some justification for uniting these two subjects under a single committee.

Twenty years ago there were 47 standing committees in the House, a cumbersome structure with no planned or logical organization. Mr. Wadsworth of New York, in an effort to help correct what he termed "this hodgepodge conglomeration of committees in the House" recommended the consolidation plan which was considered and accepted as most practical and feasible. It was Mr. Wadsworth who thought and suggested that "the Committee on Labor might well absorb the Committee on Education."

Knowing the House as I do from my experience here of 14 years, 12 of which were served as a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I feel sure that even at the time of this action there was skepticism among the Members, skepticism which is evidenced by the long months of study and discussion devoted to this entire question of reorganization.

Yet even conceding the point that sufficient reason existed at that time to combine the subjects of education and labor does not alter the fact that there is present today no justification for this common Committee on Education and Labor.

The individual areas of education and of labor, which though not unwieldy were large in 1946, are in 1967 giants. The scope of each has broadened to almost inconceivable limits with, of course, the proportionate advances in the field of education being greater.

The diversity of each from the other has increased with the expansion of each. Interrelationships exist, but to no greater extent than among other subject matters dealt with by our Government in general and the House of Representatives in particular.

Now it has come that we have the vital subject of education, which is the basis of all growth and progress in our country—and I might add the hope for solution to many of our problems—grouped with the sensitive subject of labor, which involves our Nation's economy, entire capacity for production and thus directly our standard of living.

Under the executive branch's classification of subject areas, education and labor fall into two separate, distinct Departments—that of Health, Education, and Welfare and that of Labor. And as you know, there is now a Presidential recommendation to combine this latter Department with another, involving yet other subject areas and serving to widen thus further the chasm, legislatively speaking, between education and labor.

Development of huge new Federal programs in each area has not necessarily led to increased proximity of the subjects. This development has added com-

plexities and with them additional study and work required in each area.

Alone, the increase in the sheer volume of legislation in each area has been phenomenal. It is becoming more and more difficult for a single Member to be knowledgeable in both the subjects of education and labor. This difficulty naturally extends itself to the committee staff members.

We are, as Mr. Wadsworth was, as much concerned with the psychological aspects of a Member's committee assignment as we are with the pure mechanics of his position. Members of the House of Representatives, as all men, must be convinced that the work they are doing is important, necessary in order to be able to perform to capacity.

However, that which is required of a conscientious member of the Education and Labor Committee has mounted to heights never dreamed of even 20 years ago. Therefore, there is no valid argument that separation would reduce the prestige or responsibility of the members of the two individual committees because the work of each would be more limited in scope and reduced from that done by the committee as it now stands, combining the two fields. True, the work would be lessened, but only in volume and variety not in importance. Separated, each field would offer even greater potential and challenge to a Member.

By allowing the Committee on Education and Labor to stand as a single unit which functions in two very large and very different realms of responsibility, we are encouraging a single unit of crescendo purview and power. I believe we have reached the point of centralization of too much diversified responsibility in one committee and concentration of too varied a workload upon its members and its staff.

With all this in mind, I have come today to introduce a resolution which would dissolve the present Committee on Education and Labor and establish a major Committee on Education, consisting of 25 members, and a major Committee on Labor, consisting of 25 members.

Just a little less than 4 years ago, I introduced in this body an almost identical resolution. Actually, this differs from my original proposal only in that it includes jurisdiction designations for several major programs enacted since 1963.

The need for the separation of education and labor existed at the time of my first resolution; the need is imperative now.

During this period of inaction since my plea in the 88th Congress for this division, no less than three major governmental organizations have resulted from legislation originating from the Education and Labor Committee. They are, of course, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, and the Manpower Administration which, although it includes other previously enacted programs, is charged with the responsibility of administering the Manpower Development and Training Act.

I repeat—the need is imminent.

We must have this separation of education and labor. We must have it in order to guarantee thorough study and careful deliberation of all the problems and proposals related to each individual area. We must have it to insure well-informed Members who have adequate time and the assistance of a specialized committee staff to remain current in that particular area and sufficient interest to prompt logical conclusions and intelligent projections.

I intend to ask for a hearing and consideration of this resolution at the earliest possible time, and I respectfully urge the serious attention of all Members of this House to this proposal.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 183), and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 183

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Page Belcher, Oklahoma; Charles M. Teague, California; Catherine May, Washington; Robert Dole, Kansas; George V. Hansen, Idaho; William C. Wampler, Virginia; George A. Goodling, Pennsylvania; Clarence E. Miller, Ohio; J. Herbert Burke, Florida; Robert B. Mathias, California; Wiley Mayne, Iowa; John Zwach, Minnesota; Thomas S. Kleppe, North Dakota; Robert D. Price, Texas; John T. Myers, Indiana.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: William H. Harrison, Wyoming; Louis C. Wyman, New Hampshire; Burt L. Talcott, California; Charlotte T. Reid, Illinois; Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Michigan.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: William H. Bates, Massachusetts; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; William G. Bray, Indiana; Bob Wilson, California; Charles S. Gubser, California; Charles E. Chamberlain, Michigan; Alexander Pirnie, New York; Durward G. Hall, Missouri; Donald D. Clancy, Ohio; Robert T. Stafford, Vermont; Richard S. Schweiker, Pennsylvania; Charles A. Halleck, Indiana; Carleton J. King, New York; William L. Dickinson, Alabama; Charles W. Whalen, Jr., Ohio; James V. Smith, Oklahoma.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY: William B. Widnall, New Jersey; Paul A. Fino, New York; Florence P. Dwyer, New Jersey; Seymour Halpern, New York; W. E. (Bill) Brock, Tennessee; Del Clawson, California; Albert W. Johnson, Pennsylvania; J. William Stanton, Ohio; Chester L. Mize, Kansas; Sherman P. Lloyd, Utah; Benjamin B. Blackburn, Georgia; Garry E. Brown, Michigan; Lawrence G. Williams, Pennsylvania; Chalmers P. Wyle, Ohio.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: Ancher Nelsen, Minnesota; William L. Springer, Illinois; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; William H. Harsha, Ohio; Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Maryland; Frank J. Horton, New York; Joel T. Brodyhill, Virginia; Larry Winn, Jr., Kansas; Gilbert Gude, Maryland; John Zwach, Minnesota; Sam Steiger, Arizona.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR: William H. Ayres, Ohio; Albert H. Quie, Minnesota; Charles E. Goodell, New York; John

M. Ashbrook, Ohio; Alphonzo Bell, California; Ogden R. Reid, New York; Edward J. Gurney, Florida; John N. Erlendson, Illinois; William J. Scherle, Iowa; John R. Dellenback, Oregon; Marvin L. Esch, Michigan; Edwin D. Eshleman, Pennsylvania; James C. Gardner, North Carolina; William A. Steiger, Wisconsin.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Frances P. Bolton, Ohio; E. Ross Adair, Indiana; William S. Mailliard, California; Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, New Jersey; William S. Broomfield, Michigan; J. Irving Whalley, Pennsylvania; H. R. Gross, Iowa; E. Y. Berry, South Dakota; Edward J. Derwinski, Illinois; F. Bradford Morse, Massachusetts; Vernon W. Thomson, Wisconsin; James C. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Paul Findley, Illinois; John Buchanan, Alabama; Robert Taft, Jr., Ohio.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS: Florence P. Dwyer, New Jersey; Ogden R. Reid, New York; Frank J. Horton, New York; Donald Rumsfeld, Illinois; John N. Erlendson, Illinois; John W. Wylder, New York; Robert Dole, Kansas; Clarence J. Brown, Jr., Ohio; Jack Edwards, Alabama; Guy Vander Jagt, Michigan; John T. Myers, Indiana; Fletcher Thompson, Georgia; William O. Cowger, Kentucky; Margaret M. Heckler, Massachusetts; Gilbert Gude, Maryland.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION: Glenard P. Lipscomb, California; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; Charles E. Chamberlain, Michigan; Charles E. Goodell, New York; Samuel L. Devine, Ohio; William L. Dickinson, Alabama; James C. Cleveland, New Hampshire; John Kyl, Iowa; Albert H. Quile, Minnesota; Fred Schwengel, Iowa; William O. Cowger, Kentucky.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS: John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; E. Y. Berry, South Dakota; Craig Hosmer, California; Joe Skubitz, Kansas; Laurence J. Burton, Utah; Rogers C. B. Morton, Maryland; Wendell Wyatt, Oregon; George V. Hansen, Idaho; Ed Reinecke, California; Theodore R. Kupferman, New York; John Kyl, Iowa; Sam Steiger, Arizona; Howard W. Pollock, Alaska; James A. McClure, Idaho.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE: William L. Springer, Illinois; J. Arthur Younger, California; Samuel L. Devine, Ohio; Ancher Nelsen, Minnesota; Hastings Keith, Massachusetts; Glenn Cunningham, Nebraska; James T. Brophy, North Carolina; James Harvey, Michigan; Albert W. Watson, South Carolina; Tim Lee Carter, Kentucky; G. Robert Watkins, Pennsylvania; Donald G. Brotzman, Colorado; Clarence J. Brown, Jr., Ohio; Dan Kuykendall, Tennessee.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: William M. McCulloch, Ohio; Richard H. Poff, Virginia; Arch A. Moore, Jr., West Virginia; William T. Cahill, New Jersey; Clark MacGregor, Minnesota; Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Maryland; Edward Hutchinson, Michigan; Robert McClory, Illinois; Henry P. Smith, III, New York; William Roth, Delaware; Thomas J. Meskill, Connecticut; Charles W. Sandman, Jr., New Jersey; Thomas F. Railsback, Illinois; Edward G. Biester, Jr., Pennsylvania; Charles W. Wiggins, California.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES: William S. Mailliard, California; Thomas M. Pelly, Washington; Charles A. Mosher, Ohio; James R. Grover, Jr., New York; Rogers C. B. Morton, Maryland; Hastings Keith, Massachusetts; Jack Edwards, Alabama; G. Robert Watkins, Pennsylvania; Ed Reinecke, California; Henry C. Schadeberg, Wisconsin; William Roth, Delaware; John R. Dellenback, Oregon; Howard W. Pollock, Alaska; Philip E. Ruppe, Michigan; Daniel E. Button, New York.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE: Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; H. R.

Gross, Iowa; Glenn Cunningham, Nebraska; Edward J. Derwinski, Illinois; Albert W. Johnson, Pennsylvania; James T. Brophy, North Carolina; Daniel E. Button, New York; William L. Scott, Virginia; Philip E. Ruppe, Michigan; James A. McClure, Idaho; Fletcher Thompson, Georgia.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS: William Cramer, Florida; William H. Harsha, Ohio; James R. Grover, Jr., New York; James C. Cleveland, New Hampshire; Don H. Clausen, California; Robert C. McEwen, New York; Joe Skubitz, Kansas; John J. Duncan, Tennessee; Fred Schwengel, Iowa; Henry C. Schadeberg, Wisconsin; M. G. (Gene) Snyder, Kentucky; Robert V. Denney, Nebraska; Roger H. Zion, Indiana; Jack H. McDonald, Michigan; John Paul Hammerschmidt, Arkansas.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS: James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Charles A. Mosher, Ohio; Richard L. Roudebush, Indiana; Alphonzo Bell, California; Thomas M. Pelly, Washington; Donald Rumsfeld, Illinois; Edward J. Gurney, Florida; John W. Wylder, New York; Guy Vander Jagt, Michigan; Larry Winn, Jr., Kansas; Jerry L. Pettis, California; Donald E. Lukens, Ohio; John E. Hunt, New Jersey.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES: John M. Ashbrook, Ohio; Del Clawson, California; Richard L. Roudebush, Indiana; Albert W. Watson, South Carolina.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: E. Ross Adair, Indiana; William H. Ayres, Ohio; Paul A. Fino, New York; John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; Charles M. Teague, California; Seymour Halpern, New York; John J. Duncan, Tennessee; Theodore R. Kupferman, New York; John Paul Hammerschmidt, Arkansas; William L. Scott, Virginia; Margaret M. Heckler, Massachusetts.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: Barber B. Conable, Jr., New York; George Bush, Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARNATIONS IN HONOR OF WILLIAM MCKINLEY

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], who is the dean of the Republican delegation from Ohio, to announce that the carnations have been distributed today by the Republican delegation from Ohio in honor of William McKinley, whose birthday will occur on Sunday next, January 29.

The Ohio Republican delegation has done this every year for many, many years, because McKinley not only was a beloved Governor of Ohio but also was one of our outstanding statesmen and Presidents.

We have always felt it fitting that the Republicans in the House do this, because we believe one of the great contributions McKinley made to his country was as

a Member of the House, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and as chairman of that great committee.

Ordinarily the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] performs this task, because he represents the district in which McKinley was born and where he practiced law in Ohio before being elected to Congress. Unfortunately Mr. Bow is unable to be with us today since he is confined to the hospital. I am sure I speak for the membership of the House that he will have a complete and early recovery.

I take great pleasure in making this announcement to the House concerning the carnations and the recognition of McKinley's birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as this coming Sunday is the birthday anniversary of one of our martyred Presidents, a distinguished son of the great State of Ohio, I rise to make a few observations about William McKinley.

President McKinley received his political schooling in this body, as it were, serving six terms in the House of Representatives before he was elected Governor of Ohio, from which office he went to the White House.

His career spanned a period of momentous changes in American life. When he was born 124 years ago, the Stars and Stripes flew over no Pacific territory; when he died the whole Pacific Ocean had become a special American concern. He rose from the ranks to major in the Civil War, at time when this Nation's vital interests were almost wholly domestic; he served as Commander in Chief of the short war with Spain which helped to heal the wounds between Blue and Grey and, wittingly or not, made the United States a world power with vast responsibilities in foreign affairs which are with us to this day.

President McKinley was struck down by an anarchist's bullet shortly after he was resoundingly reelected to a second term with Theodore Roosevelt as his vice-presidential running mate. Had doctors then known of today's wonder drugs, his life might have been saved and the political currents of the 20th century might have run quite different courses. These are the imponderables of history, which make it such a fascinating study.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this annual tribute to William McKinley who so ably served his congressional constituents, his State and the United States, and gave his life in the service of his country as its 25th President.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have

5 days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANDRUM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NOISE POLLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening, January 19, 1967, I had the honor of being a member of a panel at a meeting conducted by the New York State Society of Professional Engineers, New York chapter, on the subject of "The City and Its Environment—Noise in the City."

Other speakers included Mr. William H. Correale, P.E., technical director, code project, Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute; Mr. Michael J. Kodaras, acoustical consultant, on "Noise Transmission in Building"; Dr. Wilbur J. Gould, M.D., noted surgeon and otologist from Lenox Hill Hospital; and Mr. Roy F. Sullivan, M.A., noted audiologist, director of the Audiology Research Laboratory, the Long Island College Hospital in Brooklyn, on "Impact of Noise on Human Beings." Mr. Kurt Rosenbaum, P.E., served as moderator.

I reviewed my legislative proposals on noise, H.R. 2819 in this Congress—H.R. 14602 in the 89th Congress—and my previous statements which will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 7, pages 8745-8769; volume 112, part 8, pages 9470-9476; volume 112, part 8, page 9680; daily edition, May 16, 1966, pages A2629-A2630; volume 112, part 9, pages 1291-1306; daily edition, August 1, 1966, pages A4038-A4049; volume 112, part 14, pages 18233-18257; volume 112, part 15, page 20388; volume 112, part 20, pages 27803-27824; volume 112, part 20, page 27874; and January 18, 1967, pages 788-810.

There follow the talks by Roy F. Sullivan, William H. Correale, and Michael J. Kodaras:

NOISE IN THE CITIES: ITS EFFECT ON THE HEARING MAN

(By Roy F. Sullivan, M.A., director, Audiology Research Laboratory, the Long Island College Hospital)

By ASA definition, "Noise is any undesired sound." The term "undesired" introduces no small degree of subjectivity into this specification. Consider the case of the audiophile in apartment 710, totally immersed in a concert level rendition of Moussorgsky's "Night on Bald Mountain" to the hapless or perhaps just uncultured residents of apartments 610, 810, 709 and 711 this would undoubtedly with subjective unanimity constitute a most undesirable of noises. There are, however, certain aspects to the problem of noise and its effects on man which may be examined more logically if not objectively.

The first slide presents a schema or outline of some of the ostensibly more common effects of noise on the hearing man. A definition of terms is in order here.

Noise induced Permanent Threshold Shift or PTS refers to that irreversible, unremitting

impairment of hearing which may be solely attributable to the effects of prolonged exposure to physically intense levels of noise. Noise induced Temporary Threshold Shift or TTS represents a transient decrement in auditory sensitivity, also attributable to high level noise exposure. The combinations of intensity and duration, however, are such that when a day's exposure is terminated, hearing will revert to the previous nontraumatized level. Glorig indicates that this reversal should take place within a span of about 16 hours. Both permanent and temporary threshold shift have an organically determinate effect on man and may be assayed objectively. They are included under the major heading physiological as distinguished from, but hardly dichotomized with the heading psychological. The philosophical mind-body problem remains as such, a problem.

Under the latter psychological categorization, we have interference effects. For example, noise may interfere with a speaker-listener or orthotelephonic system, street noise may interrupt a sidewalk telephone conversation, subway noise may elicit the Lombard effect or the tendency to raise one's voice in a background of noise. We have all experienced this last transitory phenomenon which terminates immediately together with the noise, or perhaps embarrassingly a bit later as one finds oneself shouting to a friend 12' distant on a stalled crowded subway. SIL refers to speech interference level a quantity to be mentioned later.

Interference with activity includes noise effects on occupational activity, recreation, perhaps we might even include inactivity, that is sleep. Again, to a man, we have been unceremoniously aroused during a night's sleep by some manner of air or motor vehicular traffic noise and generally been worse for wear the next morning. Annoyance levels implies impersonal or group consensus of dissatisfaction with the ambient or transient acoustic state of affairs in the office or, especially in the sanctum sanctorum, the home.

As one scans down the list of effects a number of approximately monotonic orderings may be noted:

(1) The minimally requisite acoustic noise energy for a given effect generally decreases. That is to say, energy in the IT or intensity times time sense. It takes less noise energy to just interfere with a telephone conversation than to just induce a temporary auditory threshold shift. In the same vein, the acoustic basis for one's annoyance with the neighbor's musical indiscretions may amount to put 34db on a sound level meter A scale provided that the hour and other conditions are adventitiously inappropriate.

(2) Next, an effect achieving a given maximum schematic ranking will generally include those responses found in lower positions. For example, any noise energy capable of inducing a permanent auditory threshold shift will most assuredly cause a temporary threshold shift, interfere with speech communication and probably annoy as well. The converse also appears to hold.

(3) Finally, as one again descends the list, the effects become progressively more evanescent, more difficult to document objectively; especially as we transcend from the realm of the physiological to that of the psychological; from the soma to the psyche. To illustrate a dB hearing, impairment ascribable to a noise induced permanent threshold shift is easily objectified through any number of available audiometric techniques. It may even be verified histologically, the latter unfortunately, only post-mortem. On the other hand, temporary threshold shift by definition, slips away with rest time and removal from the organically irritating noise stimulus. Speech interfer-

ence is immediately contingent upon the presence of a certain spectrum and level of noise being easier to identify pragmatically through experience of communication difficulty in its presence, than through detailed acoustical analysis. Finally, how does one scale with any degree of validity the annoyance of sounds.

The usable range of human hearing extends non-linearly in frequency from 16 to 20,000 cycles per second and in intensity from 0 through 140dB re 10⁻¹⁶W/cm². There are more than 300,000 tones of different frequency and/or intensity which can be distinguished in the auditory area and virtually an infinitude of discriminable tonal combinations, a fair proportion of which produce the effects outlined in the preceding framework.

Keeping in mind this outline slide 3 presents a cutaway section of the human ear divided into outer, middle and inner portions with concomitant complex central neural pathways.

Sound pressure variations are focused on the tympanic membrane from the outer ear, the ossicular chain consisting of the smallest bones in the body, acts as a transformer carrying sound to fluids of the inner ear or cochlea. Here also in the middle ear are two of the smallest muscles in the body the stapedius and tensor tympani which serve to reflexively defend the delicate inner ear structure to an extent from potentially injurious sounds. Slide 4 illustrates the range of level above thresholds in which this protective mechanism comes into play, generally 70 to 90dB above threshold of audibility. Next, we see the extent of shift in sensitivity of the ear in responses to voluntary contraction of these muscles, primarily a low frequency attenuation stiffness effect.

Here we have a longitudinal section of the snail shell cochlea. We see the organ of Corti a transducer responsible for translating acoustic hydraulic pressure variation into neural impulses. This juncture is affected at the hair cells as the hairs are bent in contact with the tectorial membrane. In general, certain areas of the cochlea are delegated responsibility for certain portions of the audible frequency range. Sections near the base or widest part of the cochlea facilitating hearing in the range of 4,000 to 6,000 cps are most susceptible to damage by noises. There are three rows of outer hearing cells and one row of inner numbering in total around 24,000. The outer hair cells are most susceptible to noise induces hearing loss. Noise induced hearing loss may be specifically attributable to physical destruction of the hairs with later degeneration of the hair cells and neural ganglion cells, and/or perhaps to the creations of some toxic products in response to overstimulation.

Next slide. Numerous studies have been undertaken to assess those levels critical to potential hearing damage. They are in general agreement. This chart is excerpted from AF 160-3, an Air Force Manual on noise hazards. In general levels of 85 dB in critical active bands between 300 and 4800 cps suggests the use of ear protection, ear plugs, etc., levels in excess of 95 dB make this mandatory. The next slide illustrates from the same source, a nomograph which allows an individual to reckon his noise exposure on an energy basis where one may trade an infrequent brief exposure to a high level noise for a longer, more frequent exposure to a lower level. This is similar to the monitoring approach on radiological or x ray technicians. It should be added that intermittent sounds are more damaging to hearing than continuous. This is probably attributable to a latency or delay in activation of the protective middle ear muscle reflex.

Next, this is an audiogram demonstrating a typical permanent threshold shift as a consequence of impairment in a traumatically high noise level occupation. Starting at 4,000 and 6,000 cps the impairment is generally not noted save perhaps for monitoring audiometry by a provident employer, until the speech frequency range is affected, that is 500 through 2,000 cps. There is no medical or surgical recourse for these individuals and they are among the poorest candidates for prosthetic amplification or hearing aids. The topic of litigation and compensation for a hearing loss is an evening's symposium in itself.

The next slide shows a temporary threshold shift following from the beginning to end of a noisy work day.

Glorig has suggested that injury to hearing acquired in a single highly intense blast be called acoustic trauma; that accumulated over a more prolonged exposure to lesser levels, noise induced hearing loss. The latter may be divided into occupational hearing loss and what he refers to as Sociocusis, the noise induced hearing loss accumulated other than in the course of daily labor—in the subways, in traffic, even in the discotheques, where a recent article in a woman's magazine cited a decidedly traumatic level of 105 dB for one of the more prominent establishments AU Go Go.

When sociocusis, occupational hearing loss and the products of otic diseases have been subtracted off, the remaining auditory deficit, solely attributable to the inexorable process of aging is called presbycusis. Next slide: we might extrapolate the amount of hearing loss due to living in a mechanized urban society from the data of Dr. Rosen who surveyed a relatively noise-free African jungle tribe, the Mabaans. Here one sees a significant difference in high frequency threshold as a function of age, especially in the septuagenarian relatively in a similarly aged not "significantly noise exposed U.S. group." One should interpret these findings with caution however in light of cultural, hereditary, diet and other similar environmental differences between the two societies.

Generally the crucial parameters for noise potentially inducing hearing loss are: (1) frequency spectrum, (2) injury in critical octave bands especially in the frequency range 300 to 4800 cps, (3) duration of exposure, (4) frequency of exposure. Getting into the psychological effects as with the physiological octave band analysis of the noise within the frequency range previously cited plays an important role in assessing effect. While speech interference level is a more complex measure than I can outline here, the next illustration shows in terms of sound level meter readings the effect of the typical broad spectrum noise on speech communication. Note that none of these levels broach the traumatic.

With regard to fatigue performance and job efficiency effects, these findings may be summed by stating that the bulk of studies undertaken to date have demonstrated negative results. Furthermore, those few positive generally have serious flaws in their experimental design. Finally, annoyance. . . Numerous scales have been constructed to take into account not only the frequency nonlinearity of the ear but also the relative annoyance of a sound. Kryter has suggested that the following qualities contribute to the annoyance of sounds:

- (1) Unexpectedness
- (2) Interference
- (3) Intermittency
- (4) Reverberation
- (5) Inappropriateness.

One such annoyance rating system promulgated by the ISO gives weighted consideration to noise sound pressure in various octave bands, arrives at a rating and then corrects for the following factors (Slide)

which may be of interest. With this system, community and individual response can be predicted with a fair degree of accuracy based upon this empirical approach to noise annoyance analysis. Next slide is a portent of noise to come. With the advent of SST this shows a scheme for predicting community response to sonic booms as outlined by European OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development).

In summary, (slide 1) we see a gamut of responses to noises ranging from irreversibly debilitating physiological trauma through mild perturbation or annoyance. While the tangible effects of noise on personality, performance and daily routine have yet to be authenticated it is felt that if the Founding Fathers of our country were contemporaries we might have been granted in the Declaration of Independence an inalienable right to choose life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in relative peace and quiet.

REMARKS BY MR. CORREALE

One of the first steps taken in the writing of a new building code for New York City was research and investigation intended primarily to uncover the latest information available with respect to all of the elements which go to make up a performance type building code.

These investigations also revealed a number of new elements relating to safety, health and general welfare in buildings and one of these was noise. We learned that the codes in a number of European countries did include provisions for the control of noise in multiple dwellings and had for some time. As for the United States, we found only a brief reference to the control of noise in the N.Y. State Building Code, and found also that some active research on noise in buildings and its effects was under way. We therefore decided that the control of noise in multiple dwellings should be added as an item of building regulation and with the approval of the then Commissioner of Buildings, Harold Birns, this was done.

The publicity which followed this decision generated a surprisingly large response. We received requests for copies of our noise control provisions from communities and individuals across the country and from some foreign countries including Israel and Italy. Public support as expressed in correspondence, newspaper and magazine articles exceeded any of our expectations. But along with this we received quite a few requests to include the control of external noises such as that from trucks, buses, construction equipment and the like, as well as airplane noises in the vicinity of airports. These, of course, are not susceptible of regulations in a building code.

We therefore arrived at a solution limited specifically to multiple dwellings and covering the following four categories:

1. Control of airborne noises between adjacent apartments, hallways, etc.
2. Control of impact noises between apartments.
3. Control of structure-borne noises originating in moving machinery and equipment.
4. Control of noise reaching apartments from equipment located on adjacent buildings.

All of the provisions are written insofar as practicable, in performance language, making reference to national standards available to designers as guides to solutions which will meet the performance goals established. These standards are primarily test standards for materials and assemblies of materials but provision is also included for the field testing of completed construction on an optional basis if and when found necessary.

So much for the broad picture. In working up details, we utilized the expertise of Michael J. Kodaras and Associates, Con-

sultants in Acoustics, whom we retained specifically for this work. Mr. Kodaras will review these details with you.

REMARKS BY MR. KODARAS

Where the exhausted air may contain toxic substances or strong objectionable odors, the exhaust system shall be independent of exhaust systems serving other parts of the building.

1207.11 Ventilation for Special Uses and Occupancies—Special uses and occupancies, not provided for in this article, shall be ventilated in accordance with the requirements of Article 7. Ventilation of stage areas shall be in accordance with the requirements of Article 8.

SECTION 1208.0—NOISE CONTROL IN MULTIPLE DWELLINGS

1208.1 Requirements—Interior wall, partitions, floor-ceiling constructions, and mechanical equipment in spaces or buildings of Occupancy Group J-2 shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of this article, to provide minimum protection for each dwelling unit from extraneous noises emanating from other dwelling units and from mechanical equipment. In addition, airborne sound from exterior mechanical equipment of buildings in any occupancy group shall conform to the requirements of this article.

(a) Field Testing—Where conditions indicate that the installed construction or equipment does not meet the noise control prescribed in this article, measurements shall be taken to determine conformance or non-conformance. For conformance with this article, the results of such measurements shall not fall by more than 2 db to meet the requirements in any octave band, or by more than two points to meet any STC or INR requirements.

1208.2 Acoustical Isolation of Dwelling Units—

(a) Airborne Noise—(1) Walls, partitions, and floor-ceiling constructions separating dwelling units from each other or from public halls, corridors, or stairs shall have a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 45 for airborne noise. This requirement shall not apply to dwelling unit entrance doors.

(2) STC ratings shall be obtained by tests conducted in accordance with the procedures of Reference Standard RS 12-2 except as provided in (3) below.

(3) The STC ratings of construction assemblies as listed in Reference Standard RS 12-2 may be used to determine conformance with the requirements of (1) above and with any other section that requires a specific STC rating.

(4) Penetrations or openings in walls, partitions, or floors for pipe sleeves, medicine cabinets, hampers, electric devices, or similar items shall be packed, sealed, lined, back-plastered, or otherwise isolated by sufficient mass to maintain the required STC ratings.

(5) Where grilles, registers, or diffusers in one dwelling unit are connected by ductwork with grilles, registers, or diffusers in another dwelling unit, and where such connecting duct is less than 7 ft. long, it shall be lined with duct lining; otherwise, an approved sound attenuating device shall be installed therein. Duct lining shall conform to the requirements of Article 13.

(b) Structure-borne Noise—(1) Floor-ceiling constructions separating dwelling units from each other or from public halls or corridors shall have a minimum Impact Noise Rating (INR) of 0.

(2) Such INR shall be obtained by tests conducted in accordance with the procedure of Reference Standard RS 12-3 except as provided in (3) below.

(3) The INR of a floor-ceiling constructions listed in Reference Standard RS 12-3 shall be used to determine conformance with the requirements of (1) above and with any

other paragraph that requires a specific INR. Constructions shall be designed and installed to avoid short circuiting the isolation devices that are incorporated into the constructions.

1208.3. *Noise Control of Mechanical Equipment*—(a) *Minimum Airborne Noise Insulation Requirements*—(1) Boiler rooms—Boiler rooms adjoining dwelling spaces, either vertically or horizontally, shall be separated therefrom by floor-ceiling or partition constructions have a minimum STC rating of 50.

(2) Mechanical equipment spaces—Spaces or shafts containing air conditioning, refrigeration, or ventilating equipment, ele-

vator machinery, or other mechanical equipment shall be separated both vertically and horizontally from dwelling units by constructions that will provide a minimum STC rating of 50. Spaces or shafts containing equipment totalling more than 75 rated h.p. shall not be located vertically or horizontally adjacent to dwelling units unless the total sound power level output of all the equipment in the space or shaft is certified not to exceed the maximum soundpower levels of Table 12-3 in any octave band. Such sound power level ratings shall be obtained by tests conducted in accordance with the procedures of Reference Standard RS 12-5.

TABLE 12-3.—Maximum sound power levels permitted in mechanical spaces or shafts adjoining dwelling spaces

Octave bands (c.p.s.)	Maximum sound power level (decibels) *	
Midfrequency	Decibels re 10 ⁻¹² watts	Decibels re 10 ⁻¹² watts
63	101	91
125	101	91
250	103	93
500	105	95
1,000	102	92
2,000	101	91
4,000	98	88
8,000	96	86

* The maximum sound power levels shall be reduced 5 decibels in any octave band where the equipment data indicate pure tone generation. The presence of pure tones may be determined by means of $\frac{1}{3}$ octave band analysis. The criterion for a significant pure-tone component shall be an audible pure-tone sound together with an increase of the sound pressure level in the corresponding $\frac{1}{3}$ octave band above the mean of the 2 adjacent $\frac{1}{3}$ bands of at least:

Center frequency of $\frac{1}{3}$ octave band.....	40/125	160/250	215/500	630/1,000	1,000/10,000
Increase in sound power level (decibels).....	6	4	3	2	$\frac{1}{2}$

a. *Ventilating Openings into Mechanical Equipment Spaces*—Ventilating openings into boiler rooms and other mechanical equipment spaces shall not be located in yards or courts where there are windows opening from living quarters, unless such ventilating openings are provided with sound attenuating devices if needed to limit noise transmission to NC-40 (Noise Criterion) levels in the exposed dwelling units.

b. *Noise Criteria Requirements*—Noise criteria requirements prescribed in this article shall be in accordance with Reference Standard RS 12-4.

(3) *Ductwork*—Ducts serving dwelling units shall be lined with duct lining for at least 20 ft. from the fan discharge or intake; otherwise, an approved sound attenuating device shall be installed therein. All toilet exhaust ducts shall be lined with duct lining for at least 20 ft. upstream of the exhaust

fan intake, otherwise, an approved sound attenuating device shall be installed therein. Duct lining shall conform to the requirements of Article 13.

(4) *Exterior Mechanical Equipment*—Mechanical equipment in a building in any occupancy group, when located outside of the building in a yard or court or on a roof, or where the equipment opens to the exterior of the building, shall be subject to the noise output limitations given in Table 12-4 where one or more windows of a dwelling unit in any building in Occupancy Groups J-1, J-2, or J-3 is located within a sphere of 100 ft. radius whose center is any part of the equipment or its housing, unless it can be shown that the sound pressure levels, in octave bands, of the exterior mechanical equipment as measured within the dwelling unit do not exceed the levels given in Table 12-5.

TABLE 12-4.—Maximum sound power levels permitted for exterior mechanical equipment adjoining buildings

Minimum distance from equipment to exterior window (feet) *	Maximum sound power levels in octave bands—decibels re 10 ⁻¹² watts *							
	Octave bands—c.p.s. midfrequency							
	63	125	250	500	1,000	2,000	4,000	8,000
12.....	100	94	88	83	80	78	77	76
25.....	107	100	94	89	86	84	83	82
50.....	113	106	100	95	92	90	89	88
100.....	119	112	106	101	98	96	95	94
	In octave bands—decibels re 10 ⁻¹² watts							
	12.....	90	84	78	73	70	68	67
	25.....	97	90	84	79	76	74	73
	50.....	103	96	90	85	82	80	79
	100.....	109	102	96	91	88	86	85

* The minimum distance shall be measured in a straight line regardless of obstructions. Interpolated levels may be used for distances between those given in this table. See note a at end of table 12-3.

CXIII—111—Part 2

TABLE 12-5.—Noise output limitations for exterior mechanical equipment

[Maximum sound pressure level * (not to be exceeded in any octave bands)]

Octave bands mid-frequency c.p.s.)	Decibels re 0.0002 microbar
63	64
125	57
250	51
500	45
1,000	41
2,000	39
4,000	38
8,000	37

* (1) Measurements shall be obtained with a sound level meter and octave band analyzer, calibrated both electronically and acoustically before and after the measurements are made. The equipment used shall meet the requirements of Reference Standards RS 12-6 and RS 12-7. (2) The measurements shall be obtained with the microphone of the measuring equipment located at the interior of the dwelling unit affected in a line with the window nearest the exterior mechanical equipment. The window shall be fully open and the microphone shall be located 3 feet away from the open portion of the window. (3) Measurements shall be obtained during times when the ambient sound pressure levels, in octave bands, are at least 6 decibels lower at all octave bands than the sound pressure levels measured with the exterior equipment operating. By ambient sound pressure levels is meant the measured sound pressure levels, at the above-described measuring location, with the exterior equipment not in operation.

(b) *Minimum Structure-borne Noise and Vibration Isolation Requirements*—All isolators used in accordance with the following requirements shall be approved.

(1) *Boiler Rooms*—

a. *Boilers*—All boilers supported on floors above a story having dwelling units shall be supported on resilient isolators having a minimum static deflection of 1 in. The isolators shall be installed directly under the structural frame of the boiler.

b. *Boiler Breeching and Piping*—When boilers are equipped with mechanical draft fans, the boiler breeching and piping that is supported from or on slabs, floors, or walls that are contiguous to dwelling unit shall be supported for a distance of 50 pipe diameters on or from resilient isolators. Each isolator shall have a minimum static deflection of 1 in.

(2) *Incinerator Charging Chutes*—

a. *Metal Chutes*—Metal chutes, metal chute supports, and/or metal chute bracing, shall be free of direct contact with the shaft enclosure and the openings provided in the floor construction. Metal chutes shall be resiliently supported at each structural support location. Isolators shall provide a minimum static deflection of 0.30 in. All chutes shall be plumb.

b. *Masonry Chutes*—The interior chute wall shall be plumb and without obstructions for the full height of the shaft and shall have a smooth interior finish.

(3) *Piping*—

a. *Metal piping connected to power driven equipment* shall be resiliently supported from or on the building structure for a distance of 50 pipe diameters from the power driven equipment. The resilient isolators shall have a minimum static deflection of 1 in. for all piping with a 4 in. or larger actual outside diameter and $\frac{1}{2}$ in. for piping with less than 4 in. in actual outside diameter. Piping connected to fluid pressure-reducing valves, shall be resiliently isolated for a distance of 50 pipe diameters from pressure reducing valves and isolators shall provide a minimum static deflection of $\frac{1}{2}$ in.

b. *Equipment such as heat exchangers, absorption refrigeration machines, etc., that is located on any floor or roof other than a floor on grade, and that is not power driven but is connected by metal piping to power driven equipment, shall be resiliently supported from or on the building structure. The resilient supports shall be vibration isolators having a minimum static deflection of 1 in.*

and shall incorporate approved resilient pads having a minimum thickness of $\frac{1}{4}$ in.

(4) Fans—All fan equipment located on any roof or floor other than a floor on grade shall be mounted on or from vibration isolators. Fan equipment with motor drives separated from the fan equipment shall be supported on an isolated integral rigid structural base supporting both the fan and motor. Fan equipment with motor drives supported from the fan equipment shall be mounted directly on vibration isolators. Each isolator shall have provision for leveling. Isolators shall incorporate resilient pads having a minimum thickness of $\frac{1}{4}$ in. The vibration isolators shall provide a minimum isolator efficiency of 90% at fan rotor rpm with a maximum deflection of 2 in.

(5) Pumps—All pumps of 3 h.p. or more located on any floor other than a floor on grade shall be supported on vibration isolators having a minimum isolation efficiency of 85% at the lowest disturbing frequency. Each isolator shall incorporate a leveling device and a resilient pad having a minimum thickness of $\frac{1}{4}$ in.

(6) Compressors—Compressors and drives located on a floor other than a floor on grade shall be mounted on vibration isolators having a minimum isolation efficiency of 85% at the lowest disturbing frequency. Each isolator shall incorporate a leveling device and a resilient pad having a minimum thickness of $\frac{1}{4}$ in.

(7) Cooling Towers—All moving parts of cooling towers located on a roof or floor other than a floor on grade shall be installed on vibration isolators providing a minimum isolation efficiency of 85% at fan rotor rpm with a maximum static deflection of 4 in. Each isolator shall incorporate a leveling device and a resilient pad having a minimum thickness of $\frac{1}{4}$ in.

(8) Evaporative Condensers—Evaporative and air cooled condensers located on a roof or floor other than a floor on grade shall be mounted on vibration isolators providing a minimum isolation efficiency of 85% at fan rotor rpm with a maximum static deflection of 4 in. Each isolator shall incorporate a leveling device and a resilient pad having a minimum thickness of $\frac{1}{4}$ in.

(9) Duct Connections to Fan Equipment—Flexible connections shall be installed between fan equipment and connecting ductwork.

(10) Elevator Machinery—Gear-driven machinery, gearless machinery, motor generators, and controllers located in an elevator machinery room or shaft on a roof, or on a floor other than a floor on grade, shall be supported on vibration isolator pads having a minimum thickness of $\frac{1}{2}$ in.

(c) *Maximum Permissible Air Velocities in Ducts*—(1) Ducts Located Over Ceilings of Dwelling Spaces—The maximum permissible air velocity in ductwork located over the ceilings of dwelling spaces or in masonry shafts adjoining dwelling spaces shall not exceed the velocities prescribed in Table 12-6.

TABLE 12-6.—Maximum permissible air velocities in ducts
(In feet per minute)

Type of system	Branch ducts	Submain ducts	Main ducts
Low velocity.....	750	1,000	1,500
High velocity.....	1,000	2,000	3,000

In the application of Table 12-6 the following shall apply:

a. Any duct that connects directly to any terminal device (grille, diffuser, etc.) shall be classified as a branch duct for a distance of at least 4 ft. from the terminal device.

b. Any duct that connects a branch duct to a main duct or to the fan shall be classified as a sub-main duct. No duct may be classified as a sub-main duct if it connects to a terminal device by means of a connection less than 4 ft. in length.

c. When a duct is connected to the fan and to two or more sub-main ducts it shall be classified as a main duct.

d. The maximum velocities shown in Table 12-6 for low velocity ductwork shall apply in all cases except where a system of round ductwork is used and an acoustic air control device with self-contained attenuation components is located in the duct work prior to each air terminal device. Branch ducts, if any, connecting the acoustic air control devices to the terminals shall not have air velocities exceeding 750 fpm. Maximum power level ratings for the acoustic air control devices shall be 3 db less than the values shown in Table 12-7.

(d) *Maximum Permissible Sound Power Levels of Fan Coil Units, Grilles, Registers, Diffusers and Induction Units*—Sound power level data, in octave bands, shall be certified in accordance with the provisions of Section 106.2, for grilles, registers, diffusers and induction units at design operating conditions and for coil units when operating at specified cfm. The sound power levels shall not exceed the levels listed in Table 12-7 when measured in accordance with the provisions of Reference Standard RS 12-5.

TABLE 12-7.—Maximum permissible sound power levels for terminal units

Octave bands (c.p.s.)	Sound power levels (decibels)	
	decibels re 10 ⁻¹² watts	decibels re 10 ⁻¹² watts
Midfrequency		
63	79	69
125	73	63
250	67	57
500	62	52
1,000	59	49
2,000	57	47
4,000	54	44
8,000	53	43

REFERENCE STANDARD RS-12 LIGHT, HEAT, VENTILATION AND NOISE CONTROL

List of referenced national standards

ASA-Z224.3—American Standard Sound Level Meters for Measurement of Noise and Other Sounds—1944.

ASA-S1.4—General Purpose Sound Level Meters—1961.

ASHRAE—Guide and Data Book—1965-66.

ASTM-E90—Tentative Recommended Practice for Laboratory Measurement of Airborne Sound Transmission Loss of Building Floors and Walls—1961T.

ASHRAE-36—Standard for the Measurement of Sound Power Radiated from Heating, Refrigeration, and Air Conditioning Equipment—1962.

ASHRAE-36B—Standard Method of Testing the Acoustical Performance of Terminal Units—1963.

Reference standard RS 12-1—Heating

1. *Heating capacity*—The heating capacity required in each room or space shall be calculated in accordance with the principles set forth in ASHRAE Guide and Data Book; American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers: 1965-66. The calculations of heating capacity shall consider the areas and transmission coefficients of all surfaces exposed to outdoor temperatures or to unheated areas, and shall include allowance for air infiltration and wind velocity. In spaces with high ceilings, an allowance shall be made for the effect of stratification so that the prescribed temperature will be maintained at a level 5 ft. above the floor.

Reference standard RS 12-2—Sound transmission class

1. *Test procedures for STC ratings*—The STC rating of a construction assembly shall be obtained by one of the following methods:

(a) *Laboratory Test*—In accordance with ASTM E90-61T, Tentative Recommended Practice for Laboratory Measurement of Air-

borne Sound Transmission Loss of Building Floors and Walls;

(b) *Field Test*—in accordance with either of the following:

(1) ASTM E90-61T, omitting paragraphs 3(b), 3(c), 3(d), and 3(f).

(2) London, Albert; Methods of Determining Sound Transmission Loss in the Field; Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards, May 1941.

2. *STC test data*—The following test data may be used in obtaining STC ratings:

Title and Publishers

"Sound Insulation of Wall Floor and Door Construction" (Supplement to Building Materials and Structures Report No. 144), February 27, 1956. Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

"Sound Insulation of Wall Floor and Door Construction" (2nd Supplement to Building Materials and Structures Report No. 144), Dec. 1, 1958. Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

"Sound Reduction Properties of Concrete Masonry Walls," 1955, and "Report of Sound Transmission Loss and Air Flow Resistance Measurements on Concrete Block Wall," March 1, 1959 (4db must be deducted from data contained in "Sound Reduction Properties of Concrete Masonry Walls" in accordance with page 3 of the Report). National Concrete Masonry Association, 2009 N. 14 Street, Arlington 1, Va.

"Noise Control with Insulation Board for Homes, Apartments, Motels, Offices," AIA File No. 39B, Third Ed., 1964. Insulation Board Institute, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago 2, Ill.

In addition, certified laboratory test data obtained by acoustical laboratories in accordance with ASTM designation E90-61T shall be submitted.

Reference standard RS 12-3—Impact noise ratings

1. *Test for INR*—The INR of a floor-ceiling construction assembly shall be obtained in accordance with FHA Bulletin No. 750, Impact Noise Control in Multifamily Dwellings, January 1963.

2. *Test data for INR*—The following test data may be used for INR: (a) F.H.A. Bulletin No. 750, January 1963.

3. Certified laboratory test data obtained by acoustical laboratories in accordance with F.H.A. Bulletin No. 750, and Bulletin No. R140-1960(E), International Organization for Standardization (ISO).

Reference standard RS 12-4—Noise criteria levels

NC levels shall be as shown in Figure 2 on Page 195 of ASHRAE Guide and Data Book, 1965-66.

Reference standard RS 12-5—Test procedures for sound power level

The sound power levels for air terminal units shall be measured in accordance with ASHRAE No. 36B-63, Standard Method of Testing the Acoustical Performance of Terminal Units. The sound power level of equipment other than terminal units shall be measured in accordance with ASHRAE No. 36-62, Standard for the Measurement of Sound Power Radiated from Heating, Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Equipment.

Reference standard RS 12-6

ASA Z224.3—American Standard Sound Level Meters for Measurement of Noise and Other Sounds—1944.

Reference standard RS 12-7

ASA S1.4—General Purpose Sound Level Meters—1961.

FOR LESS WASTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to a very serious problem confronting our schools and colleges—a problem, really, of intergovernmental relations—which the Congress alone can solve. In brief, it is the immense burden we are placing on educational administrators by late funding of Federal programs. This is often compounded by 1-year authorizations which are not renewed until well into the next fiscal year and, therefore, must be funded so late that the school or college year is far advanced before money is available. This situation has become so critical in the past 2 years that educators all across the country have urged members of our Education and Labor Committee to initiate remedial action. In recent hearings conducted by the Special Subcommittee on Education chaired by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] which were held in nine cities across the country, this was the largest single complaint by educators and State and local officials about our whole vast Federal educational effort. A typical comment was offered by a spokesman for the California School Boards Association, who described the result of late funding as "chaotic."

Although this problem has occurred from time to time in the past in connection with Federal programs, there is a compelling reason why we must now give it urgent attention. The volume of Federal funds handled by the U.S. Office of Education has swollen from \$272.6 million in 1957 to \$3.9 billion in 1967.

When funds of this magnitude are poured into the educational system, through dozens of important programs ranging from preschool to graduate school, and are made available months after educational administrators must prepare their own programs and budgets—sometimes after the school year has begun—the effect on program planning, budgeting, personnel planning, and general administration is disastrous. Inevitably, there is also a considerable waste of funds due to hasty and faulty use which cannot fairly be blamed on our educators or upon Federal officials in the executive branch. The fault lies with Congress.

I am proposing the following remedies, several of which we can apply in the authorizing legislation handled by the Education and Labor Committee.

First, I shall work for authorizations for all major programs of at least 3 years' duration.

Second, I shall suggest that all major new programs provide for a year of advanced planning to permit adequate preparation by Federal, State, local, and institutional officials and administrators.

Third, I shall strive personally to broaden Federal programs to remove narrow and tedious limitations and to bring about maximum flexibility and local administrative responsibility in the use of Federal funds.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution calling upon the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate to take early action on appropriations for Federal educational programs. My resolu-

tion directs the committees in each body to report such a bill by May 1 preceding the fiscal year for which such appropriations are authorized. Actually, the House committee reported the Labor-HEW appropriations bill for fiscal 1966 on April 29, 1965; but it was not reported in the Senate until August 31, 1965—well into the fiscal year and only a few days before the beginning of a new school year. Thus, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which had become law on April 11, could not be implemented until very late in the school year.

The appropriations for this fiscal year were even later. A bill was reported in the House on April 28, 1966, but it was not reported in the other body until September 22 and did not become law until November 7, 1966. Meanwhile, to make matters worse, the 1-year authorization for most of the Elementary-Secondary Act were not extended until November 3, 1966—months after the new school year had commenced. Both these situations ought never to occur again, and the responsibility lies solely with the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose is not to scold committees of the Congress but to suggest corrective action in light of a new situation that has arisen. In short, that we gear educational authorizations and appropriations to the actual school and college year, and that we act far enough in advance to permit adequate planning for the use of Federal funds. Although my resolution speaks only to the appropriations committees—because theirs is an annual process—I recognize the heavy responsibility of the substantive committees to assure that the authorizing legislation is scheduled so as to permit a timely appropriations procedure. Personally, for the sake of our school systems, I would hope that every authorization which is intended to be extended would be extended a full year prior to its expiration date; and I shall work with my colleagues to assure that this is done.

Happily, Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan matter. Every single Member of this House, and of the other body, would agree that our own processes should not impede educational progress. I view my recommendations as being a modest but vital step toward the goal of a truly creative federalism.

MEETING THE CHALLENGE OF OVERHEAD TRANSMISSION LINES AND TOWERS

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, as the author and original sponsor of legislation to spur the development of feasible methods of underground transmission of electric power, I was gratified to see the program included in the Budget submitted by the President to the Congress this week.

It has been a long hard fight to obtain recognition of the Federal obligation in this area and I wish that I could greet the President's recommendation with enthusiasm. Regrettably, I cannot.

The considerable study I have put into this problem over the past few years and the results of the hearings on my legislation in the Senate Commerce Committee last year, leave me convinced that the program as proposed in the Budget message is not in the best public interest and will not do the job.

My opposition to the proposal in the budget does not mean that I feel that there is any less urgency in solving the problem. Quite the contrary. The problem grows more serious and more difficult with each wasted year and I am reintroducing the powerlines legislation that I first proposed in the 89th Congress with a plea for speedy congressional action.

ACTION NEEDED

Last year's Senate hearings on my legislation clearly support this plea. Testimony from experts and the general public revealed for the first time the damage that high voltage lines and towers inflict upon communities and on our environment—the economic losses from depreciated property values and lowered tax revenues; the disrupted planning and the scenic blight. They showed that because of the Nation's growing power needs, especially around our great cities, the problem will become dramatically worse in a short time unless action is started soon. Although there were sharp differences in some areas, the hearings revealed that the Federal agencies, the utility industries, and the general public were in general agreement as to the need for action and Federal initiative.

The proposal put forward in the budget would appropriate \$2 billion for fiscal 1968 for the Secretary of the Interior to begin a new research and development program. This program is based upon the report to the President, "Program for Advancing Underground Electric Power Transmission Technology," submitted by the Secretary of Interior on April 27, 1966.

PROGRAM OF \$30 MILLION

There are several important issues involved here that must be understood before this body acts upon this recommended appropriation. First, this is not a \$2 million program. It is the first step in a program that is to cost more than \$30 million over the next 5 years.

Second, this is not a program specifically authorized by Congress. In fact, in action in the other body last year this same program was quite specifically rejected. In asking for the initial appropriation this budget relies upon the general authority of the Secretary under Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1950. I do not believe this authority is adequate. I question whether it is in the public interest to allow such a substantial research commitment to be made without congressional authority—without guidelines and goals set and approved by Congress.

The problem goes even deeper however. When I introduced the first powerlines legislation in August of 1965, I also proposed to vest the authority in the

Interior Department. I did so because of the Department's charter to protect and enhance the Nation's resources and because of its substantial involvement in power generation and transmission in the West. However, my legislation also set firm guidelines and goals to protect the public interest and to assure that the fullest and most economic use is made of all our Nation's talent and resources in such an effort. In the Senate hearings it soon became apparent that the Executive found such guidelines onerous.

In addition, it also became obvious that, along with other serious defects, the program advanced by Interior was oriented almost entirely to the utility industry approaches and that the Department's involvement in power transmission was an encumbrance rather than a help in advancing creative solutions.

It also became clear that the most critical aspect of the powerlines problem involved our cities.

HUD SELECTED

For these reasons, I recommended in my testimony that my original proposal be changed to vest the responsibility for the initial research with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. The members of the Senate Commerce Committee concurred and, on August 31, 1966, legislation to give HUD the authority to carry forward initial studies was favorably reported to the Senate. The excellent report on the measure filed by the committee explains in greater detail both the faults of the current Interior proposal and the urgent need for action. I include in the *RECORD* following my remarks so that my colleagues may have at their disposal all the relevant facts before taking final action on this budget request.

I profoundly hope that this 90th Congress will complete the work which the 89th Congress left undone and get us started now on a program to meet the growing problem of overhead transmission lines and towers. But a program of the size and scope needed must be carried forward in a way that will get the job done efficiently and economically. It must protect the broadest public interest and assure that no single segment of our economy benefits at the expense of the others. It must have congressional authorization setting goals and guidelines. This need not mean delay. We have the information we need to pass sound legislation now.

I urge my colleagues to reject the budget proposal for underground powerlines research and undertake instead the better program that is needed.

The report follows:

OVERHEAD ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION LINE STUDY
[Calendar No. 1519, 89th Congress, 2d Session, Senate Report No. 1556, August 31, 1966.—Ordered to be printed]

(Mrs. Neuberger, from the Committee on Commerce, submitted the following report to accompany S.J. Res. 189:)

The Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (S.J. Res. 189) to provide for a study of the impact of overhead electric transmission lines and towers upon scenic assets, zoning and community planning, property values, and real estate revenues, having considered the same reports favorably thereon with an amendment

and recommends that the resolution as amended do pass.

BACKGROUND AND NEED

Reconciling the Nation's use of its resources with the maintenance of a pleasing environment in which to live is difficult. Industry and improving technology are two of the brightest elements of our national history. Depletion of resources, pollution of the atmosphere and the water, and defacing the countryside are inevitable byproducts of our prosperity unless conscious efforts to the contrary are taken. Immense effort has gone into the creation of our material well-being, and now the Nation is beginning to recognize that considerable effort must be expended in order to remove the environmental scars resulting from this prosperity. Just as the Nation has come to realize that even our economy cannot afford unlimited expenditures, the Nation is slowly realizing that it cannot afford a permanent destruction of any significant portion of the environment.

THE CHALLENGE

People who do not live near power corridors and those unfamiliar with the tremendous and necessary expansion scheduled for power transmission over the next few years may have some difficulty appreciating the urgency and importance of the transmission line problem. To them, the environmental challenge may seem relatively modest. Unfortunately, this is not the case.

Today, there are more than 300,000 miles of overhead transmission lines and towers strung throughout the United States. More than 7 million acres are consumed in these power corridors and an untold number of additional acres are affected by the structures which range in heights up to 150 feet. Some estimates are that in settled suburban areas, in addition to the right-of-way, up to 300 acres are affected along each corridor mile of 250-kilovolt transmission line and towers.

There is no question that there will be a radical increase, not only in the number of lines, but in the impact on our environment. According to conservative estimates, the power needs of the Nation will more than double by 1980. In addition, the need for better and stronger interties within and between systems will require a significant increase in both the number and capacity of transmission lines. The 1965 blackout in the Northeastern United States dramatically emphasized this.

One of the more significant aspects of this growth is that it will not be evenly distributed across the Nation. A large share of new construction will take place in and around expanding metropolitan complexes where the need for power to support the growing population and expanding industry is already being felt. In the search for reliable and economic sources of power, metropolitan utilities must reach far beyond their immediate service area.

Another factor is the increase in the capacity of the transmission facilities themselves. Before 1953, the largest transmission line in the United States was 230 kilovolts and the average line was only about 138 kilovolts.

However, to bring power into the cities economically and efficiently, it will be held necessary to increase the capacity of the transmission line. Since 1953, 6,300 miles of 345-kilovolt lines have been installed and there has been a substantial investment in larger lines ranging up to 500 kilovolts.

Recently, a major utility announced plans to construct 1,050 miles of 765-kilovolt lines on 4,000 steel towers ranging through five Midwestern and Eastern States. This line will reach 145 feet into the air and will require a corridor 250 feet wide. Consideration is being given to lines with even greater capacity.

IMPACT ON ENVIRONMENT

The impact of such powerlines, towers, and corridors on the environment is pervasive and complex.

Conservation and esthetics

The construction of a transmission line may involve the destruction or defacement of a unique scenic or recreation area. In some cases, historical sites and wildlife preserves have been affected. It is difficult to place a value upon such natural assets. The conflict between power and esthetics is often won by default, because under present methods, no one has been able to match the dollars and cents construction figures with an equally precise calculation of the natural values.

It has been estimated that 40 percent of the populations' recreational activity comes from walking or driving simply for the pleasure of open areas. Considering the investment in such activities and the importance of preserving recreational opportunities as our metropolitan complexes grow, the costs of relocation or undergrounding intruding transmission lines may be relatively modest.

Many of the more scenic mountainous areas are the location of power sources and the beginning of a transmission line. Not only are the towers sometimes silhouetted against the horizon as they cross the hills, but chemical sprays are often used to maintain a clear right-of-way.

Impact on cities and suburbs

Little is known about the impact of transmission lines, towers, and corridors upon urban and suburban areas. Crossing through a planned suburban community or a densely settled area, the lines clearly have a substantial effect upon the settled environment, but there is no precise, impartial evaluation of the extent and cost.

Obviously, land condemned as right-of-way for a power corridor is barred for future development. There can be no question that this can have a direct effect on local real estate tax revenues and on community planning, but the nature of this effect—whether a net gain or loss—has never been assessed. Land may be lost from the tax rolls, other land may be devalued for tax purposes, or new structures may increase the tax base.

At the present, the costs of a transmission line right-of-way are usually determined under laws and precedents originally established when the paramount need was to expand the Nation's power system. The courts may not now consider other factors than value of the property immediately taken, but this does not mean that adjoining property is not affected. The failure of the courts to allow a noncontiguous landowner to recover a claimed loss resulting from the erection of transmission lines cannot be construed as proof that the land value has not been affected. Adequate information would help all parties concerned to reach equitable solutions to the inevitable problems. In one case reported in the hearings, availability of information concerning actual damage involved a difference of \$48,000 per mile in an award.

There is some evidence that the towers and lines may have an impact extending far beyond the immediate right-of-way. People near these lines sometimes experience interference with television and radio reception. This is particularly true on amateur bands. People express the fear that the structures looming over suburban areas have a depressing effect on the real estate market and decrease the value of property.

To describe the situation in this manner is not to assume that the effect of transmission lines is always disruptive and harmful nor to imply that unfavorable impact on the environment can always be avoided.

Industry and growing communities need reliable and economic power. When there is a conflict between this need and the need

to preserve a livable environment, it becomes necessary to work for a compromise, but the only way such a compromise can be worked out is if all of the economic factors are known. These factors are not known today and will not be known until there is an adequate study.

Safety

The impact of transmission lines and towers on the public safety has never been adequately studied. Organizations representing airplane pilots were able to give documented and detailed information on the hazards to air navigation and on airplane accidents attributable to electric power transmission lines. Reference has been made to injuries and deaths resulting from falls from the towers, from accidental contact with lines while flying kites and from contact with downed lines in storms and other accidents. While it is possible that such hazards are not as significant as many fear, an impartial study would aid in answering the questions.

Impact on planning

Transmission facilities can have a devastating impact upon community planning and zoning efforts. Increasingly, communities and builders have come to recognize the value of long-term planning and zoning efforts. Substantial long-term investments are dependent upon such planning; and disruption can not only involve significant direct economic losses, but also undermine public confidence, the cornerstone of sound planning.

One dramatic example was described in the hearings. A community in the Northeast had developed a long-range plan for the improvement of school facilities. This plan involved the construction of separate junior and senior high schools which were to share common facilities. Economy dictated the construction of the high school first. After the high school was constructed, plans were announced to build a transmission line down a corridor that would pass directly through the site planned for the common facility. The entire school program was delayed for several years.

The Federal Government has taken a leading role in encouraging community planning and coordinated development. The creation of the new cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development is a clear expression of the importance that is attached to this objective, and clearly, there is a problem here of sufficient scope to warrant Federal attention.

UNDERGROUNDING

The most obvious alternative to overhead lines and towers is to place them underground. This is now being done to a considerable extent with distribution lines and to a much lesser extent with certain transmission lines.

The distinction between transmission and distribution is not always clear, even to the power engineer. In general terms, transmission involves the transportation of large blocks of power, usually in excess of 69 kilovolts, to switching stations where it is broken down for distribution to consumers in smaller voltages over smaller lines.

In the mid-1950's, many communities began to exert pressure to put the distribution lines underground. At this time, it cost 10 times as much to put these smaller lines underground as to put them overhead in the traditional manner.

However, in the face of mounting pressure, the utilities developed new techniques, and today the ratio is reported to be about 1½ to 1. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has given this trend a new impetus by providing for undergrounding of distribution lines in new Federal Housing Administration developments.

Unfortunately, the technology of underground construction has not kept pace with

that of transmission lines, at least in the United States. As a result, there is very little accurate information as to costs for lower voltages and practically no information concerning either technology or costs for lines with a capacity in excess of 345 kilovolts. This is a very serious deficiency, since the expansion over the next decade will unquestionably occur in these higher voltage ranges.

At the committee hearings, estimates of the cost of underground construction ranged from 2 to 26 times that of overhead. In part, this reflects the general lack of actual construction experience upon which to base estimates, but it also reflects the lack of accurate information about the true costs of overhead lines to the communities through which they pass.

When utilities estimate the cost of overhead construction, they understandably take into account only the expenses of land acquisition and construction for which they pay. As previously noted, the costs to local communities, if any, in lost revenue, disrupted planning, and depreciated real estate value are not computed. Recently, however, the cost of land acquisition in some metropolitan areas has risen so, that undergrounding has become economically desirable from the utility point of view.

The Interior Department report to the President on underground technology (Program for Advancing Underground Electric Power Transmission Technology, Apr. 27, 1966), which reflected a close identification with industry problems, recognized this cost factor in recommending that all transmission lines within 30 miles of the center of populated areas should be placed underground within the next decade.

Such absolute determinations obviously cannot, and should not, be made in the absence of more complete information on all relative costs, but the Department's recommendation clearly represents a growing awareness on the part of the industry that a problem does exist which needs attention. That report and the Woodside, Calif., experience, described in detail below, suggest that perhaps Federal agencies will begin to set precedents in proposing solutions. Previously, there has been little indication of awareness at the Federal level.

OTHER ALTERNATIVES

Placing transmission lines underground would answer many of the objections raised against transmission lines. It is, however, not necessarily the only way to resolve environmental conflicts.

In selecting overhead transmission routes, the utilities naturally choose the route which is most economical. At the present, having no data on the cost of such installations to local communities, they necessarily base this judgment wholly upon land acquisition, construction, and maintenance costs. When the complete cost factors are available, it will be easier to determine not only whether underground construction is warranted, but also whether the proposed overhead route is, in terms of total cost, the most economic. This will provide a useful basis for working out compromises when conflicts arise in the future.

ALLOCATION OF COSTS

Once the problem of attempting to set values on these community costs has been attacked, there still remains the question of who should pay any additional expenses that are incurred in relocation or undergrounding.

Should a community which derives no direct benefit from the power transmitted be required to pay for a more expensive routing or undergrounding necessary to protect local property? Should consumers in a city help pay for the costs of protecting the property values of a community through which their power is transported?

Finally, are there areas of sufficient importance so that the costs of rerouting or

undergrounding should be borne by the entire nation?

None of these questions can be answered until there is some way to calculate the relative values and benefits involved.

SOURCES OF DATA

The State and Federal agencies responsible for approving routes and authorizing construction often have no figures of their own. In the main, they rely upon the utility involved. The utility, as a regulated industry, is charged with responsibility for keeping costs low. Extra costs must be passed on to their consumers in the form of rate increases. Unless the communities or individuals are able to translate damages into dollars-and-cents figures which can be assessed, the utilities do not, and perhaps cannot, consider them in evaluating the most economic route for a line.

Unfortunately, there are not many experts in this field, and difficulties have been experienced in obtaining objective data. Unless a Federal agency, not involved with the utility industry and not marketing power of its own, but experienced in planning and environmental studies, undertakes to develop impartial data, there is less chance that the needed cost figures will be made available.

HISTORY OF THE RESOLUTION

Senate Joint Resolution 189 was originally introduced as S. 2507, and was, in part, the subject of 3 days of hearings.

These hearings gave an opportunity for the great public interest in transmission line construction to be voiced. Many Federal agencies, individuals, and citizens groups were heard, and communications from a great many more were received.

The committee also reheard the now classic story of the transmission line at Woodside, Calif. This 220,000-volt line was being built by the Atomic Energy Commission to supply the linear accelerator at Stanford University. The town of Woodside requested that the line be put underground to preserve the scenic beauty of the area. This request was denied and Federal legislation was needed to clarify the authority of the Atomic Energy Commission with respect to these matters. The President appointed Mr. Laurance Rockefeller to make recommendations on this matter. One of those recommendations was that the line should be placed underground in 5 to 7 years, if the local community had made reasonable progress to underground its own lines. In the meantime, the AEC line was specially constructed to attempt to make it blend into the natural environment of the area. In a situation such as this, the study contemplated in Senate Joint Resolution 189 would have been of immense value. As it was, the Congress, the President, and a panel of private citizens were involved in trying to reach a solution. (See appendix.)

As the hearings developed, however, it became clear that S. 2507 would have to be redrafted. S. 2507 was originally drafted to have the Department of the Interior bear the major responsibility for the study. It became apparent that, because of the Department's significant interest in the operation of hundreds of miles of overhead transmission lines, the charge of bias could be raised. In addition, the expertise of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the problems of cities and their outlying regions became clearer, as well as the fact that there was no preexisting relationship with the electric industry. Accordingly, the Department of Housing and Urban Development was selected to be the prime mover in the study.

The original bill contained broad language, but was aimed at rather specific objectives. In the committee's redrafting process, it became clear that the various concerns and details could be better expressed in the resolution form rather than bill form; hence, that change was also made.

COMMITTEE COMMENT

Based on the hearings held over a 3-day period and on the significant number of communications received, it has become apparent that, while many decisions involving transmission lines are supposed to be decided on the basis of costs, the complete costs are in fact not known. In some instances, not only are the costs unknown because they were not considered, but some costs are unknown because the means of measuring them are difficult, if not impossible, with presently available techniques.

The difficulty of measurement should not be used as an argument for not attempting to measure them. In view of normal business requirements and the legal obligation of a regulated industry to maintain low rates, the industry cannot and should not be expected to calculate all of these factors. There is a clear Federal role in attempting to make these measurements.

The resolution is drafted to authorize the Department of Housing and Urban Development to conduct these studies. The question of the ability of HUD to make these measurements was posed to that Department. Their response was as follows:

"As to the specific issues raised in your letter, it will not be easy to develop objective standards for assessing the impact of overhead lines. Perhaps the major area susceptible measurement will be the changes in property values. However, the difficulty of constructing definitive standards should not be permitted to discourage efforts to develop them. On the contrary, it becomes all the more necessary to provide the best possible basis for making informed professional judgments based on the best available data and opinions."

The committee considers this response to be sufficiently encouraging to make this resolution meaningful and even essential.

The question may be raised as to whether the Department of Housing and Urban Development is the proper agency since much of the impact of transmission lines falls on rural areas. The Department addressed themselves to this point when they stated:

"Clearly, a study of this kind is related to the mission and programs of this Department. Our most direct interest would lie in the determining of the impact of high-tension lines on the quality of the urban environment, changes in urban land use and values, and the comprehensively planned development of communities of all sizes. This type of research would, of course, have to be closely correlated with the work of the Office of Science and Technology and the Department of the Interior on the technological problems involved in undergrounding."

The committee considers it essential that such work be closely correlated with the Department of the Interior and the Office of Science and Technology, as well as other groups so that the greatest expertise can be brought to bear on these difficult problems.

In addition to Government agencies, it is important that private groups be consulted. The Edison Electric Institute has offered their assistance and they have suggested that the Electric Research Council, which encompasses all segments of the industry, may be able to help.

SAN DIEGO'S 200TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in 1969, my home city of San Diego will cele-

brate her 200th birthday. It will be an auspicious occasion, for during these past two centuries San Diego has grown from a sleepy Spanish village into a gleaming metropolis of more than 600,000 modern Americans.

The city has become a hub for commerce and industry, tourism, and national defense. And San Diegans, justly proud of their heritage and achievements, are making elaborate plans for the bi-centennial observances.

I am pleased today to join with my San Diego colleagues, the gentlemen from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] and [Mr. Urr] in introducing legislation to provide for the striking of national medals to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego.

The bill we are proposing would authorize the Treasury Department to prepare the medals—but at no cost to the taxpayers. All expenses for the production of up to 500,000 of the commemorative mementos would be borne by San Diego 200th Anniversary, Inc., the non-profit corporation in charge of preparations for the year-long celebration.

From the public sale of the congressionally approved medals, the corporation hopes to raise money for such anniversary year activities as the commissioning of commemorative works of art and a possible visit by Pope Paul VI. Also planned are the establishment of a center for San Diego's newest industry—oceanography—and the designation of special months for recognizing the contributions of the city's traditional industries.

Two foreign nations, Spain and Mexico, have been invited to take part in the observances.

I urge the House to give prompt and favorable attention to this legislation to help a gracious city mark her 200th anniversary.

WORLD FARM CENTER

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has the opportunity to endorse and encourage the development of a meaningful and farsighted idea. I am introducing a resolution, today, that will, if passed, give congressional endorsement to the development of a World Farm Center.

The concept of a World Farm Center offers one of the most imaginative and creative opportunities for world agriculture. The Center would put on display the great panorama of agri-related products, ideas, and potential that is such an integral and vital part of the world economy.

The question of world food supply and production is probably one of the two most critical issues of the time. With as much as two-thirds of the world's population suffering from nutritional deficiency, it is to the mutual advantage of all to encourage the development of

institutions that will participate in shaping the needed solutions to this immense problem.

The idea of a World Farm Center was originated some 7 years ago by a group of Californians experienced in the areas of farm equipment, farm production, food processing and packaging, and farm finance. After years of preliminary planning, research, and groundwork, this original group of men succeeded in gaining the support and encouragement of every responsible segment of California agri-business.

Our Nation's responsibility and leadership in agriculture is undisputedly recognized the world over. Realizing this, the proponents of the Farm Center postulated that an institution that brought the whole of the great American agricultural technological revolution together would be of inestimable value. The Farm Center would be an institution designed to demonstrate in one place the essential interworkings of the various component elements of our huge agribusiness—a business that has given our Nation the greatest yield per acre in history and has delivered our bounty to the consumer at the lowest unit cost.

The World Farm Center will be an entirely private endeavor. The Center will not require any Government expenditures, or financial subsidies.

Secretary Freeman, in a favorable report issued on this resolution in the 89th Congress, said that it called "attention to the vital importance of agriculture in the national economy, and to the tremendous economic gains that have resulted from technological progress in agriculture. It points out that the World Farm Center is designed to improve understanding between agriculture and the general public."

Mr. Speaker, the Congress' endorsement of the World Farm Center would greatly add to an already tremendous concept. In addition, it would show the world that our Nation's political leadership encourages and supports the private initiative of its citizens in dealing with the great issues and needs of the day. This is an opportunity to demonstrate that every resource at our disposal will be used in combating man's most persistent and increasingly most acute problem—hunger.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL RESEARCH—1967

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is published in Washington on a semimonthly basis a magazine entitled "U.S. Medicine." As its name implies, it is devoted exclusively to reporting medical activities which occur in the Federal Government.

The first issue of the new year is devoted to a review of events in the Federal medical world in 1966 and I am happy

to note that considerable recognition has been given to the activities of the Veterans' Administration. VA medicine has pioneered in many fields and not the least of which has been research for the benefit not only of veterans but for all mankind.

The publisher of "U.S. Medicine" has been kind enough to grant permission to reprint a portion of the material contained in the first issue of the new year and I commend to the Members of the House the articles by Dr. Benjamin B. Wells, Assistant Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration for research and education. Dr. Wells was keenly interested in the landmark law which the 89th Congress passed and which has been designated as Public Law 89-785.

Dr. Wells was of great assistance to the committee and I am expecting nothing short of tremendous results in this field; here again, the benefit will be not only to the veterans of this country but the entire populace.

The article follows:

A STORY OF GROWTH—VA RESEARCH PROGRAM IS CLINICALLY ORIENTED

(By Benjamin B. Wells, M.D., Assistant Chief Medical Director for Research and Education in Medicine Veterans' Administration)

In the eleven years which have passed since the Veterans Administration first received a direct appropriation from Congress specifically for medical research, the research program has undergone a transition as significant as the growth from infancy to adulthood.

In size it has grown from a hopeful handful of investigators to an organized team of scientists which in 1966 consisted of 5,780 investigators working on 6,552 projects. More important, it has developed in its capacity for fruitful productivity as reflected in the 2,750 scientific papers presented at national scientific and professional meetings and 3,417 scientific articles published in recognized national journals in the last year alone.

The following description of some of our major programs in progress and some of our major accomplishments during the past year will make it apparent to the reader that a major portion of the program is clinically oriented.

CLINICALLY ORIENTED

Actually, clinical research related to disease—its treatment, amelioration, and better understanding—constitutes more than 85 per cent of the Veterans Administration's medical research effort. The balance of the program consists of essential supportive investigations of the basic research type considered to be scientifically meaningful and relevant to extending knowledge of human health and disease.

This predominant orientation of the investigative program towards clinical aspects of medicine was not deliberate, it was predestined. Medical research in the VA is a mission oriented program that is responsive to the needs of the veteran population.

Our research is accomplished largely by physicians whose first interest, and major objective, is the welfare of the patient. It was therefore inevitable that these physicians would participate in research on clinical problems confronting them at the bedside of their patients. There can probably be no better direction of medical research than this—nor better motivation.

Many of the investigators work independently of their projects. Others choose to collaborate with staff members of their own hospital or the affiliated medical school to approach problems of common interest simultaneously from several aspects. Still others pool their observations of similar pa-

tients under similar treatment in different hospitals.

These researchers take full advantage of one of the greatest opportunities offered by the VA, its unparalleled resources for the study of clinical conditions: enormous numbers of clinical cases, uniform medical records maintained according to a standard of excellence—all within a single, highly organized, integrated hospital system.

Diseases which are rare in a single hospital, or in the experience of a single investigator, become relatively common when totaled throughout all the VA health facilities, which collectively constitute the largest medical care system in the world.

RESEARCH IN AGING

The establishment by the United States Government during 1966 of Medicare to assist the aging citizen in his medical needs attests to the general concern over the results of the scientific advances: the numbers of individuals who live beyond the sixth and seventh decades has been expanded markedly.

Census figures indicate that by 1970, 28 million Americans will have passed the age of 60, compared with 24 million in 1960. This has brought into focus the lag in solving the problems of chronic disease and deterioration that increase with advancing age. The problem that faces us now is to assure these larger numbers of elderly citizens healthy and purposeful lives in their later years.

The patient population of the Veterans Administration reflects the increased utilization of hospital and clinic by this older group. The average age of all veterans is now 47 years. In 1956, the average age of the veteran patient in VA and non-VA hospital facilities was 49.4 years; in 1965, it was 54.3 years. Thus, a major concern of VA medical authorities is the care and treatment of the older veteran.

This has been reflected in the dramatic rise in the numbers of VA hospitalizations for arteriosclerotic heart disease (hardening of the arteries of the heart), the most common cause of death in the United States. Hospitalization of such cases in the VA rose from just under 12,000 in 1957 to almost 17,000 in 1965. The average hospital stay of each of these VA patients in 1965 was 34.1 days.

Strokes and other brain damage accompanying aging rose from 6,810 in 1957 to 13,111—almost double—in 1965. The average VA hospital stay for this type of case was 84.4 days.

Patients with aging lung disease (emphysema and chronic bronchitis), excluding tuberculosis, numbered 10,460 in 1957. By 1965, this had more than doubled to 21,373 VA patients, each hospitalized an average of 38.9 days.

Predicated on the FY 1965 average inpatient day cost for general hospital care of \$30.99, these three diseases of aging alone resulted in VA inpatient care costs of approximately 78 million dollars during 1965. Loss to the national economy through the loss of productivity of the affected individuals can be estimated at an almost equivalent amount. Completely immeasurable, however, is the impact on the afflicted veterans and their families in terms of the future that the Great Society holds out as a goal for every American.

EMPHASIS ON AGING

Emphasis therefore continues, as it has for the past several years, on solutions to the health problems of the aging veteran. These range from the nearly 300 individual projects, part of the 6,552 projects active during 1966; through large scale major studies by teams of professionals based in one locality; to the true cooperative study of specific therapeutic approaches to disease, involving pooling of experimental results obtained in a number of VA hospitals. There are 33 of the latter now underway in the VA, involving from 3 to 30

hospitals each. Four of these involve medical approaches to the prevention and treatment of aging of the blood vessels in heart; two involve the treatment of mental deterioration with aging; and two are studies of how the endocrine glands change with aging.

Three aging studies now underway are worthy of specific comment since they represent prototypes of research to which the Veterans Administration is uniquely suited.

EXERCISE AND AGING STUDY

Despite the medical opinions of some of the most prominent physicians on the beneficial effects of regular exercise on retarding or relieving the process of hardening of the arteries with age, the difficulties of setting up a truly controlled study have prevented the acquisition of acceptable scientific evidence to prove or disprove these opinions. Indeed there are a number of scientists who suggest, again without proof, that exercise may be harmful in this respect. At the VA Center in Bay Pines, Florida, a large scale study in its early stages whereby a group of patients with proven arteriosclerosis is being tested extensively, divided into an exercising group and a non-exercising group, and followed for a period of years. The two groups will be retested periodically and carefully checked for development of further disease in an effort to see what difference exercise has made in their health.

The Bay Pines-Jacksonville-Tampa area is particularly suited to such a study because of the large population of elderly veterans in this area, and because of the geographic stability of this population. Older citizens who settle there rarely move away again; and this, of course, is crucial to carrying out such a study over a period of years.

DOMICILIARY DIET FAT STUDY

In the VA Center at Los Angeles, a large scale study is underway in which 400 domiciliary members have had their diets altered so that the normal fat has been four-fifths replaced by unsaturated fats. This study is double blind, neither the patients nor their doctors know which patient is receiving the experimental diet and which the regular.

To set this up required unprecedented collaboration between the food industries and the investigators to develop foodstuffs such as milk, ice cream, sausage products and others that have been altered in fat content but not in taste or appearance; between the nutrition sections of the VA and the investigators, train dietitians and kitchen workers in new techniques (special meat cutters dissect each side of beef as completely fat free as possible); and between records and data handling experts, to keep the continuous flow of information on each of the patients in organized and readily available form. This study should settle the problem of the value of unsaturated fat in preventing or ameliorating arteriosclerosis in the human arteries.

NORMATIVE AGING STUDY

A long-term study of the aging process among healthy men has been undertaken by the Boston VA Outpatient Clinic. Known as the Normative Aging Study, it aims to delineate selected anatomic, biochemical, physiologic and psycho-social aspects of aging in 1,500 initially healthy males ranging in age from 25 to 65 years. The subjects volunteer to return for periodic examinations for the rest of their lives. The subjects include all socio-economic and occupational groups which are representative of the general population. This study is expected to provide descriptions of normal aging processes, prediction of later outcomes, and correlation of variables, cross-sectionally and longitudinally.

SATELLITE LABORATORY PROGRAM

In an effort to focus more intensely on the mechanisms of aging—an understanding of which will ultimately provide the means of

retarding or preventing aging-related disease and deterioration—the Veterans Administration Research Service, in 1964, conceived its Satellite Laboratory Program. Under this unique concept outstanding non-VA senior researchers are able to undertake investigations of the nature and causes of the aging processes which are related to their particular areas of interest. Laboratory facilities are provided at VA stations in close proximity to the organizations of the collaborating scientists.

By June 1966, seven satellite laboratories had been established; the calibre of the senior scientist collaborators is such that these laboratories represent a major effort in aging research in the VA hospitals in Bedford, Mass., Baltimore, Md., Downey, Ill., Buffalo, N.Y., and Sepulveda, Calif. The latter hospital is the site for three separate units.

The unit at the Bedford hospital is under the sponsorship of Doctor Marott Sinex, Chairman and Professor of Biochemistry at Boston University School of Medicine. This laboratory is concerned with changes in RNA and DNA, the substances that are the basis for inheritance. Under investigation there is one of the theories of aging—that it is a process "programmed" at birth by the genes inherited from ancestors.

At Baltimore VA Hospital, Doctor Bernard Strehler, Chief of the Biological Research Section of the Gerontological Institute at Baltimore City Hospital is the sponsor of a laboratory concerned with basic cell biology. This unit is testing systematically three proposed mechanisms of aging: that mutation of cells is responsible for the changes called aging, and ultimately for determining length of life; that the process that controls growth and differentiation of the body parts (i.e. body height, number and length of fingers, etc.), has built into it the changes of aging; and that the accumulation of certain waste materials in the cells have a role in the aging process.

Doctor Arthur Vels of Northwestern University is the sponsor of a research group at Downey VA Hospital studying the lens of the eye as a model for the aging mechanism.

At the Buffalo VA Hospital, Doctor Noel Rose from the Department of Bacteriology and Immunology, of the State University of New York heads up an investigation of the theory that aging is caused by changes in body protein, changes to which the body reacts by mobilizing its immense mechanisms by which it defends itself against "foreign" substances.

Doctor Albert Tyler, Chairman of the Department of Biology, California Institute of Technology is the sponsor of two of the three satellites at the Sepulveda hospital. These two laboratories are exploring aging from the developmental biology approach. They are separately headed by independent scientists pursuing different experimental areas.

One is concerned with the effects of manipulation of the embryo on the rate and nature of aging, and the effects of aging on the reproductive system. The other is studying the effects of one type of cell on another in the same tissue culture and on transplantation from one animal to another. The mechanisms whereby these interactions influence normal growth, aging, and abnormal growth (cancer) are the focus of the work. The third laboratory at Sepulveda is sponsored by Doctor Linus Pauling. The mechanisms of memory and their changes with age are the areas under investigation. The relationship of these mechanisms to normal sleep and to surgical anesthesia is also being studied.

RESEARCH IN INTERNAL MEDICINE

Research in internal medicine continues to be the largest segment of the Veterans Administration medical research program. Of the \$40 million allocated for the total program, almost \$11 million were utilized

for research in this specialty in fiscal year 1966.

Over 2,500 individual research projects are included covering a wide range—from purely clinical studies on the incidence, natural history, and therapy of specific diseases, to investigations into the molecular and cellular changes associated with disease. Some of the problem areas and related investigations may be described only briefly in the following paragraphs.

CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASES

Since heart disease is the leading killer of adult males in the United States today, much of the VA's research program in this area reflects the urgency attached to uncovering mechanisms for better treatments for this group of diseases.

During FY 1966, 688 research projects were being conducted in the cardiovascular area. These can be more finely divided: 323 projects were concerned with the detection and prevention of heart and blood vessel disease; 254 projects, with new approaches to treatment of these diseases; and 111 projects with the clarification of mechanisms of heart and blood vessel disease.

A physician-investigator in VAH, Birmingham has found that analysis of the motion of the chest over the heart not only gives important information on what diseases of the heart, if any, may be present; but also, by computer analysis, can yield significant information on the moment-by-moment efficiency of the heart as a pump. Such information in the past has been gathered only by such elaborate procedures requiring heart catheterization.

A physician in VAH, Washington, D.C., has been successful in detecting the degree of hardening of the arteries in patients by analyzing the shape of the pulse wave as it is transmitted through the arteries of the neck or the wrist. Since hardening of the arteries occurs at different ages in different individuals, this now enables physicians to pick out at an early age a high risk group of patients for intensive anti-arteriosclerosis treatment.

A physician in Coatesville VAH has found an abnormality of the electrocardiogram that appears to be peculiar to a certain group of mentally ill veterans. The effects of some of the potent drugs used in treating the mentally ill on the electrocardiogram is now under investigation by him.

EXPERIMENTS WITH DOGS

In Houston VAH, doctors are experimenting on dogs with complete transplantation of heart and lungs. Only when the problems and techniques have been effectively solved in animals can any such procedure be applied to patients.

In Minneapolis VAH, specific changes in the structure of the heart in patients with chronic alcoholism are being studied for clues to treatment of this type of heart disease and for a better understanding of the nutritional requirements of the heart.

In Omaha VAH, a physician has described a form of heart disease that is associated with drinking large amounts of beer daily. Details of the nature of the heart disease and its treatment are being investigated.

ARTHRITIS AND RHEUMATISM

Although not one of the major killers of our time, this disease poses an important sociological and economic problem. It leads to repeated and frequently prolonged hospitalization, and eventually cripples and deforms its victims. It is an important cause of hospitalization among the veteran population and, as a consequence, investigators at a number of VA hospitals are working on various facets of the rheumatoid arthritis problem.

The VA Arthritis and Rheumatic Diseases Study Group has completed its cooperative study assessing the value of intra-articular corticosteroid treatment of small joints by

means of Hypospray jet injection, and submitted the results for publication. In this double blind study of patients with comparable bilateral active rheumatoid synovitis of the joints of both hands and wrists the results showed a clear comparative difference in favor of medication administered by this method over placebo.

In addition, members of the Study Group compiled their experience in the clinical use of Hypospray jet injection of small joints among some 200 patients with 800 jet injection administrations. Clinical results were highly favorable.

As with diabetics, the earlier one can detect an arthritic individual and institute therapy, the more apt one is to delay the ultimate crippling and disability. A long term study of this problem continues to accept patients who have peripheral joint complaints insufficient for a definite diagnosis of rheumatoid arthritis. Each accepted patient has a normal control matched by sex and age. Clinical and laboratory progress of each patient is observed yearly.

It is hoped that long-range observation of these patients with mild disease may furnish invaluable information about the pattern of the progress of early rheumatoid disease.

GASTROENTEROLOGY

Over 500 research projects in gastroenterology, individual and collaborative, are currently underway in VA Hospitals. Cooperative studies, each of which involve several hospitals are being carried on in areas such as cancer of the esophagus, treatment of various hernia conditions involving the gastrointestinal tract, treatment of peptic ulcer, and treatment of gastrointestinal hemorrhage.

The VA Gastric Ulcer Cooperative Study has compiled pertinent information on over 800 patients and a book is being written reporting the findings regarding management of this common disorder and the reliability of stomach X-ray examination and response to medical treatment in differentiating this benign disorder from stomach cancer.

A special Purpose Research Laboratory for the investigation of liver diseases has been recently established at the Washington, D.C. VA Hospital, and is directed by an outstanding specialist in this field.

RESEARCH IN NEUROLOGY

The research program in neurology is directed into all aspects of the broad field of neurology with the exception of neurological problems of childhood. Because of the gradually increasing number of veterans in the older age group, emphasis is being given to research in diseases which are more likely to occur in this group, however, research not necessarily related to aging continues to receive strong support. Neurological diseases occurring in younger age groups which hold special interest are epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, and spinal cord injury.

A major effort to learn more about the causes and to discover improved methods of treatment and prevention of stroke continues. Two important cooperative studies on drug lipids are in progress. In one, Premarin® or a similar appearing placebo has been used in the treatment of more than 600 stroke patients in a statistically designed clinical trial. In a somewhat similar study chlorophenoxylisobutyrate (CPIB), Astromid-S, is being investigated as a therapeutic agent.

Two University-VA centers for research in the field of cerebral vascular disease, under joint National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness-Veterans Administration support, have been established. The Duke-VA Center for Cerebral Vascular Research at the Duke University Medical Center and the Durham VA Hospital is investigating the biologic and clinical aspects of cerebral vascular disease. The Boston University

Aphasia Research Center has been developed at the Boston University Medical Center, the Boston VA Hospital, and the Joseph P. Kennedy Memorial Hospital, for a center-type of total language research.

The use and development of new techniques of stereotactic neurosurgery are being employed at selected VA hospitals for improved treatment of Parkinson's disease as well as other involuntary motor disorders. Studies are underway for wider clinical application of the therapeutic possibilities of these types of treatment in other diseases, such as intractable pain associated with strokes and cancer. Basic scientific research continues on methods for improved diagnosis as well as assessment of clinical improvement in certain motor disorders after various types of medical and surgical treatment.

SPINAL CORD INJURY AND DISEASE

The area of spinal cord injury continues to be one of high priority in the VA neurological research program. Although much has been done in improving our knowledge of care of the bladder and bowel in a patient who has sustained a spinal cord injury, not only in regard to the prevention of infection and the avoidance of the hypertensive crises that occur in patients with high spinal cord injury when proper bladder drainage is disrupted, there has, as yet, been no breakthrough in the ability to promote regeneration in the spinal cord once its pathways have been interrupted. Both neurochemical and neurophysiological approaches, individually and combined are being used in an attempt to solve that basic problem.

RESEARCH IN SURGERY

Surgical research in the past year has shown a steady increase in the number of projects with 87 stations engaged in over 700 individual research protocols, including 214 new projects. This research was conducted by 650 investigators. There were 524 publications, a 20 per cent increase in the number of publications over the previous year. Interest continues heavily in gastrointestinal, heart surgery and arterial disease investigation.

The Veterans' Administration continues to play a prominent role in organ transplantation research. New developments in methods of preventing rejection of transplanted organs are being pursued at VAH West Roxbury, VAH Denver, VAH Nashville, VAH Coral Gables, and several other stations. Recent developments in improved techniques to select donors have increased successful transplants by 20-30 per cent. The investigation of anti-lymphocyte serum to reduce the rejection phenomena is receiving intensive study and beginning trial.

Hyperbaric medicine is under investigation in six hospitals with one large hyperbaric tank being in active use at Buffalo where investigative efforts are being pursued in the field of shock and peripheral vascular disease. All stations with hyperbaric facilities (of which there are four) are banded together under a single protocol to treat patients with gas gangrene.

The new technique for treatment of prostatic hypertrophy by the use of profound cold is currently under investigation at four Veterans' Administration hospitals. Initial results are most encouraging and indicate that the technique may be especially useful in treating older and debilitated patients. The use of cryosurgery has been extended to other types of cancer, especially of the mouth and tongue, with encouraging initial results. A possible increase in the patients' resistance to cancer following the freezing procedure is under investigation.

Transplantation of the heart in animals has been accomplished at the Palo Alto VAH with some long term survival in these animals. Extremely valuable physiologic information has been developed. This work has proven the feasibility and satisfactory func-

tion of a heart deprived of all nerve connections. Continued success in liver transplantation in animals is bringing this nearer to clinical application.

Several surgical cooperative studies are producing important information. A highly successful study of the value of four different operations for the very common duodenal ulcer is producing data which may lead to a better means of selecting the best type of operation for patients. The cooperative study of surgery for bleeding esophageal varices is the largest in the world and is beginning to produce important evidence and indications for the operation. The evaluation has carried out several very large studies of which more are planned. This study prepared an exhibit recently for the American Medical Association convention in Chicago and was awarded the Billings Gold medal.

Three new cooperative projects are beginning. Coronary artery disease is being evaluated by coronary angiography and surgery is being prescribed partly on the basis of the findings of this procedure. Five hospitals are ready to embark on a project to assess the value of implanting the internal mammary artery in the left ventricular wall.

RESEARCH IN CANCER

The incidence of treated cancer in the Veterans Administration continues to increase. There were approximately 45,000 cancer cases last year. The Veterans Administration's efforts have been both in the basic research with a study of epidemiology and immunology of cancer. There are six cooperative studies in cancer in the Veterans Administration involving evaluation of various treatment methods, including drugs, surgery, and x-ray therapy. These six cooperative studies involve 84 groups of investigators.

Over 5,000 patients with inoperable cancer of the lung have been treated and observed. No drug has proved more effective than nitrogen mustard which is of very limited value. Thirty-seven new cancer chemotherapy compounds have been evaluated in over 3,000 cancer patients. A large series of studies of satisfactorily screened drugs have been assessed in patients with all types of tumors.

The value of various cancer drugs in conjunction with surgical removal of tumor of the lung, colon, rectum and stomach has to date shown no beneficial effect. The invaluable experience and capability has, however, been developed as a result of these studies, providing an instrument for continued evaluation as new agents and approaches to the treatment of cancer are produced.

Prostatic cancer treatment has been studied and over 2,000 patients treated and observed up to three years. Accepted treatment methods will have to be carefully reviewed as a result of this work.

PROSTHETIC AND SENSORY AIDS

The most significant accomplishment of the prosthetics research program during the past year was the refinement of immediate post-surgical prosthetic fitting techniques.

The VA-sponsored research project at the VA hospital, Seattle, Washington, continued to demonstrate excellent success with this exciting method of fitting a prosthesis immediately after amputation. Some 100 cases have been fitted with excellent results. Healthier stumps, with rapid healing, have been produced. Early ambulation, frequently beginning with assistance one day post-operatively, has resulted and post-surgical pain and discomfort have been markedly reduced.

Training in the use of a prosthesis has proceeded with minimum delay, and hospitalization stays have been shortened considerably. The technique has permitted the surgeon to amputate below the knee, rather than above, an estimated three to four times

more frequently than he would have considered prudent using conventional procedures. The psychological, and economic advantages of the immediate post-surgical technique have stirred the interest of the medical community.

In the VA prosthetics center in New York City, research continued on immediate post-surgical fitting by conducting evaluation of prosthetic components and by instrument development. Several pylons designed by commercial manufacturers for use in immediate fittings were checked for adequacy. The Center also developed its own pylon which has great potential for conversion to a permanent prosthesis.

Moreover, the Center has developed an instrument to be used in tension myodesis surgery to permit better measurement of the tension applied to the muscles as each is sutured to the bone. An instrumented pylon was designed to give readings of torsion, vertical load, and shear as an amputee takes his first steps on the prosthesis, thus allowing clinical control of early progressive ambulation plus recording of later improvements.

The New York Center further investigated stance-control systems for above-knee prostheses by conducting evaluations of polycentric mechanisms developed by several VA research contractors. These evaluations combined with others are expected to result in a set of principles for clinical use of special stance-control mechanisms.

At a VA-sponsored project at the University of California at Berkeley and San Francisco, initial testing was substantially completed on a pneumatic swing-control system for above-knee amputees. This device appears to be effective and durable. Metal knee-shank assemblies for use with these pneumatic swing-control systems have been proclaimed and are also adaptable for knee-disarticulation cases. Another potentially significant contribution is the development of methods for designing linkages for knee and hip joints in artificial limbs and braces.

The possibilities of using external power in prosthetic devices continued to be studied at VA projects at the University of California at Los Angeles, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, and Gilmatic, a laboratory in Northridge, California. Electrically powered artificial arm components have been developed for possible use in mechanical arms, as well as ultimate use in completely powered prostheses.

RESEARCH IN PSYCHIATRY

Particularly significant work on the effects of endocrine and nervous system responses to stress is being done at the Developmental Neuroendocrinology Research Laboratory at the VA Hospital in San Fernando, California. Productive stress studies are also underway at the VA Center in Biloxi, Mississippi and the Psychosomatic Research Laboratory, VA Hospital, Houston, Texas.

Forty-five VA hospitals are engaged in research on alcoholism, a national problem which has been largely shunned by research organizations outside the government. The VA hospital at Topeka, Kansas, which has had such a program underway since 1946 is currently using a problem-solving approach in a group-training setting.

Variant approaches are being tried at other VA hospitals. The one at Houston features a special room where the alcoholic patient can go for intensive help when he feels he must have a drink. The Coral Gables hospital has conducted research on aversive electric shock conditioning in animals for several years and recently adopted the technique to human beings with marked success. At the Salt Lake City, Utah hospital, a three-pronged therapy is used—an orientation clinic to which physicians can refer their patients for initial examination and treatment, a preliminary series of group therapy meetings, and later intensive group therapy.

Two of the VA's psychiatric research projects have attracted considerable attention nationwide during the past year.

Doctor D. Ewen Cameron, director of the Psychiatry and Aging Research Laboratory of the Albany VA Hospital, has been testing a chemical to evaluate whether or not memory can be improved by a drug. His preliminary results indicated that memory was aided in all test subjects who had scored 60 or better on a memory quotient test before being placed on the drug. Most of the subjects used in the study were in the 50-65 age range. Improvement ranged from slight to dramatic—the better the memory quotient was at the beginning, the greater was the gain after administration of the drug. Doctor Cameron found that a relatively small gain in the memory quotient score shows up as a considerably greater gain in the subject's social behavior and ability to handle himself in day-to-day situations.

The drug tested, Cylert, is produced by Abbott Laboratories. The principal side effect noted was that the chemical may prove slightly over-stimulating to a patient in the same fashion as the psychiatric energizers. Although the drug appeared quite effective in increasing the memory quotient of a normal subject, it did not appear to help the senile or brain-damaged patient. Its future potential appears most likely as a preventive measure in persons just starting to show memory impairment.

A new dimension in treatment of psychiatric patients has evolved at the Tuscaloosa VA Hospital. Doctor James C. Folsom, a VA psychiatrist, years ago was stationed at the VA Topeka facility. While there he was exposed to Doctors Karl and Will Menninger's ideas on the importance of consistency of attitude of all concerned with the care of the mentally ill. Experimenting since 1952, Doctor Folsom has modified the original Menninger concept, leading to the formulation of five basic attitude "prescriptions".

Under this concept each psychiatric patient entering the Tuscaloosa hospital is prescribed one of these five attitudes to be used by all the hospital staff in dealings with the patient. This unique therapeutic approach has produced such effective and successful results that it has attracted inquiries from other psychiatric treatment facilities throughout the country.

RESEARCH IN PSYCHOLOGY

The complexity of the psychological aspects of the causes of disease, treatment and rehabilitative procedures in a modern health program is reflected in the broad and diverse research activities conducted by VA psychologists during the past year.

Highly qualified investigators at the VA Hospitals in Salt Lake City, Phoenix, and West Haven, have developed sophisticated instrumentation and methodology for exploring brain-behavior relationships. Rapid advances are being made in relating behavior phenomena to structure and function of the brain utilizing the evoked potential techniques. When a sensory stimulus, such as a flash of light, tap to the skin, or a sound such as a click is delivered to a man or animal, it evokes in the brain a complex sequence of minute electrical changes called evoked potentials.

The character of these cerebral evoked potentials indicates that they represent activity in several different parts of the brain and are produced by different nerve pathways. These investigators have discovered that the resultant complex wave patterns are reliable measures of cortical activity and reflect individual differences. Such investigations hold great promise for the development of objective methods for examining the functioning of the central nervous system especially in patients who cannot or will not cooperate with the usual clinical methods of sensory examination. The psychology laboratories at VA Hospitals, Sepulveda, Pittsburgh (Leech Farm Road), and Kansas City,

are complementing this work through studies in behavioral pharmacology, brain biochemistry behavior interaction and biochemical and physiological bases of learning and memory. The effects of specific brain lesions on behavior is being systematically pursued in other laboratories.

One VA psychologist at Bedford, Mass., discovered and has developed a novel electronic method, "feedback" electroencephalography, to study cortical activation and the psychological, neurophysiological, and neuropathological conditions which modify it. Among other things he is using this technique to explore automatic regulation of level of alertness without stress.

APHASIA STUDIES

Although the amount of research effort devoted to aphasia on a national level lags in relation to the magnitude of the problem, VA research psychologists are in the forefront of significant work being done in this area. For the past two years, a psychologist at the Boston VA Hospital has pursued experimental procedures for detecting brain hemisphere dominance by differential efficiency in recognizing auditory and visual linguistic stimuli presented to one side of the brain or the other. Concrete applications of this issue lie in determining the risk of producing aphasia by operating on the side of the brain affected by a removable lesion or the ability of the unimpaired half of the brain to recover speech lost by injury to the other side.

Other studies are producing evidence as to anatomic allocation of certain linguistic processes in the brain, making it possible to diagnose aphasic defects more reliably. Another research psychologist, at the Los Angeles VA Center, has developed an automated teaching system for testing and retraining of brain damaged patients who show disorders in the area of visual language functioning. Work is now in progress in the Los Angeles laboratory to determine if lengthening the delay period between speech sounds in words will eventuate in better performance by aphasics.

At the VA Hospital, West Haven, an investigator's years of careful study of normal and pathological language, resulted last year in the compilation of a conceptual dictionary of over 26,000 entries for use in language analysis. This work, of major significance, is directed toward a deeper understanding of the adaptional processes of patients as we may know them through the patient's language and also directed toward understanding the patient's integration into small groups.

PIONEERING STUDIES

The pioneering efforts of VA research psychologists at the Los Angeles VA Center in the scientific study of suicide have received world-wide recognition and have resulted in greater understanding of this behavior and development of preventative programs, both in the veteran and non-veteran population. A promising new approach to the wide range of self-destructive behavior is currently being developed in this laboratory in a study of patients who seem to be embarked on a long, devious, indirect road to self-destruction. This study will include, for example, diabetic patients who appear and reappear in hospital wards having neglected their diet and/or insulin regime. Also considered are alcoholics, drug addicts, the accident prone, careless cardinals, inappropriate risk takers and others. Important work on the meaning of death is also being done at the Los Angeles VA Outpatient Clinic.

Clinical and research psychologists continued investigative activities in the front line laboratories of patient wards. Their effort is directed toward more accurate definition and quantification of behavior, increased knowledge of traditional procedures for altering or modifying behavior, and investigation of programs designed for more

effective and successful return of patients to the community.

A research psychologist at Palo Alto VA Hospital has developed a community lodge, outside of the hospital itself, for discharged patients. No professional person is required by lodge members except on a consulting basis and one lay leader is currently on duty to supervise the productive work activities in which lodge members participate. Compared with matched controls in usual post hospital programs, these men are more frequently employed, remain out of the hospital longer and are more satisfied with their lot in life.

RESEARCH IN INFECTIOUS AND PULMONARY DISEASES

Allergy, immunology and infectious diseases are intimately interrelated. VA research in this broad area is supported by about 5 per cent of the annual research budget and includes approximately 80 programs of individual research, three cooperative studies—in chemotherapy and chemoprophylaxis of tuberculosis and therapy of fungus diseases, and three special laboratories.

Tuberculosis continues as a significant but decreasing problem among veteran patients. The tuberculosis cooperative studies of the VA-Armed Forces continue to evaluate and improve chemotherapy. A study of a new drug, capreomycin, was completed during the past year. This antibiotic was shown to be a satisfactory substitute for streptomycin in treatment of tuberculosis. A report of the study has been submitted for publication. Other studies have shown that tuberculosis of the spine can often be treated effectively with drugs alone with less frequent need for surgical fusion. It has also been shown that minimal and non-cavity pulmonary tuberculosis requires less intensive drug treatment than that needed for more extensive disease.

A number of research laboratories continue the studies of other aspects of tuberculosis. Investigators at Baltimore, East Orange, Jefferson Barracks and Minneapolis are studying drug resistance mechanisms of tubercle bacilli in relation to metabolic and nutritional requirements of the bacilli. Other investigations relate to immunization to prevent tuberculosis, and chemoprophylaxis to prevent reactivation of arrested diseases. Diagnostic tests have been improved and standardized on the basis of VA studies.

An extensive study of mycobacteria other than *M. tuberculosis* has been underway for the past decade in several research laboratories and for the past five years as part of the tuberculosis cooperative studies. The infections produced by these bacteria resemble tuberculosis but are often more severe and respond less well to treatment. Continued research, particularly at the Atlanta, Salt Lake City and San Fernando VA hospitals has resulted in better understanding of these bacteria and better diagnosis and treatment of the mycobacterial infections they cause.

FUNGUS DISEASES

Fungi which produce human infections are being investigated in basic research laboratories at Atlanta, Brooklyn, Cleveland, Fresno, Houston, Jackson, Kansas City, Long Beach, Memphis, Oklahoma City and San Fernando. The clinical diseases caused by fungi are being studied on many hospital services and great advances in the knowledge of these diseases have been made within the past decade including better definition and recognition of the clinical manifestations of fungus diseases, improvement in treatment and better identification of the epidemiology and methods of prevention of infection.

Bacterial infections such as pneumonia, osteomyelitis, pyelonephritis and dysentery are being subjected to investigation at Albuquerque, Chicago (Research), Hines, Kansas City, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Madison, Minneapolis, Nashville, Philadelphia and Washington VA hospitals. Studies in im-

munity are basic to improvement of treatment of infections as well as to development of methods for prevention of infectious diseases. Studies of pathogenesis which are underway can lead to prevention of recurrent attacks of pyelonephritis, brucellosis and similar infections. The urinary problems of paraplegic patients are receiving special attention at the Long Beach hospital.

Virus infections have come under special study particularly at the New York, Hines and Memphis hospitals. Technicians have been developed for isolation and maintenance of viruses in tissue culture. These techniques are essential to the development of vaccines. Investigators at Bronx, Cincinnati and New York hospitals are studying further the relationship of viruses to cancer. One more important aspect of these studies is to establish that vaccines grown in tissue cultures can be produced without contamination with other viruses which could cause cancer.

Basic studies in immunobiology continue to seek the mechanisms by which the body recognizes and rejects foreign living tissue. Until these can be fully understood and prevented, transplantation of tissues and organs cannot be accomplished except under unusual circumstances. Successful treatment and prevention of disease such as rheumatoid arthritis will depend on understanding and controlling the immunologic factors that underlie the diseases.

Allergy, immunology and infectious disease research in the VA provides opportunity for strictly basic laboratory study of fundamental biologic mechanisms as well as applied investigation into day by day clinical problems in wards of VA hospitals with close interrelation of these two types of research approach.

LUNG DISEASES

The principal disease of lungs which afflicts veterans is chronic obstructive lung disease. This disease complex includes asthma, chronic bronchitis and pulmonary emphysema. The similarities and differences among these disease entities have been well documented by VA investigators and others both in the U.S. and Great Britain. The physiologic derangements which result have been clearly documented and numerous methods of measuring the incapacitating effects have been devised.

Attention has been focused recently by VA investigators on studies of the etiology and pathogenesis of chronic obstructive lung diseases. If the cause or causes can be determined, programs for prevention can be developed. This would be a much more effective approach than treatment of the disease once it has become established.

Many factors have been identified as probably related—such as air pollution, smoking which provides a specific pollution of the air in the lungs, recurrent respiratory infections, allergic disorders, vascular changes and perhaps congenital predisposition. Several research laboratories are concentrating on testing these relationships. It has been found that exposure of animals to nitrous oxide absorbed on carbon particles can duplicate many of the changes seen in human lungs caused by emphysema. Similar changes can be produced by drugs and particles which obstruct the blood supply to the lungs.

Most recently it has been demonstrated that changes resembling emphysema can be produced in dogs that have been made to smoke cigarettes regularly. This work was accomplished by Doctor Oscar Auerbach in his laboratory at the VA Hospital in East Orange, New Jersey.

Radioisotope labeled serum albumen particles have been adapted to produce lung scan studies. This provides a most successful method of mapping many diseases of the lungs, especially those which involve the blood vessels. These studies are being compared with other diagnostic techniques in

one large investigation to determine the best method of detecting early and occult pulmonary embolism.

Other investigators are studying the biochemical changes that take place in lungs with diseases, both acute and chronic, compared with the changes which result from aging without diseases.

Diagnostic techniques receive considerable attention in VA pulmonary disease research laboratories. Cardiac catheterization, special X-ray studies, improvement of endoscopic methods and refinement of the tests of respiratory function receive critical study but many of these which have been developed in recent previous years are now routine service tests. The VA hospitals have received higher operating budgets to apply these procedures routinely. This has freed research money formerly committed to the support of these laboratories. This makes it possible to support new and different research programs. Currently, about 3 per cent of the VA research budget is used for pulmonary disease research.

The research summarized in the preceding paragraphs constitutes the major portion of our diversified program. But in addition to the foregoing the VA is conducting investigations in many other fields—in oral diseases, social work, pathology, in physical medicine and rehabilitation, clinical nursing, and, of course, in basic sciences.

SMALLER PROGRAMS

These smaller programs, although lesser in size and scope due to funding limitations, have produced equally significant scientific results.

The work of Doctor Liberson at the Hines VA Hospital, for instance, has attracted international attention in the field of physical medicine and rehabilitation. Development of a tartar inhibiting toothpaste by Doctor Charles M. Belting at the Sepulveda VA Hospital provides promise of eliminating the primary cause of most gum disease. It is but one of the dental research program's outstanding accomplishments. The work of Doctor Leonard Skeggs, Cleveland VA Hospital, in developing the now famous "auto-analyzer" which has revolutionized laboratory procedures is yet another accomplishment which has received widespread acclaim.

The point I am trying to make is that all good research does not necessarily have to come out of a large program; there is no correlation between size and quality in research.

CONCLUSION

It can be readily realized that a medical research program, predominantly clinically oriented in its goals and completely intramural in its constitution, provides ideal conditions for the rapid translation of results of successful research efforts into established clinical practice within a unified hospital system. Veteran patients thus stand to gain immediate and direct benefit whenever improved patient care results from VA medical research.

But such health benefits are not restricted to veterans alone. The acquired knowledge is communicated to the medical community at large through presentations at professional meetings, publications in scientific and professional journals, and through articles in the lay press. These additions to the fund of medical knowledge thus become available for use in improving the health of all mankind.

TO CREATE A NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR CRIME PREVENTION AND CONTROL

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is spending more today on fighting tooth decay than it is spending on the fight to lower the Nation's crime rate. The Federal Government is spending more for research into the uses of coal in fiscal 1967 than it is spending on research into the spiraling increase in crimes against society in this country. Our national crime rate is a matter of great concern to all Americans. In 76 percent of all crimes in this country no apprehension of the criminal is made. In many cities in the United States, both large and small, people are afraid to go out of their houses at night. Millions of Americans have in a very real sense lost not only their valued right of freedom of movement, but have also come to fear the very environment in which they live.

I am introducing today a bill to create a National Institute for Crime Prevention and Control. The purpose of this Institute would be to provide for the Justice Department a research arm comparable to the National Institutes of Health. This Institute would have as its primary task the job of assisting State and local law enforcement agencies, courts and correctional institutions in the prevention and control of crime. This assistance would be given in the form of support and coordination of research activities in the area of crime prevention and control.

The National Institute for Crime Prevention and Control would be authorized to spend \$100 million in fiscal 1968 to coordinate research of four types. The first type of research would involve the selection of police personnel. What type of man makes a good police officer? The second type of research concerns discovery of better methods for training police and correctional personnel. The third type of research would be to encourage the development of police equipment in tune with our 20th century technological capabilities. Finally, the Institute would conduct basic behavioral research on the more effective involvement of the public at large in public safety programs.

The research budget of the National Institutes of Health is over \$1.3 billion this year, while the budget of the Justice Department for crime research is only \$7.2 million. This means that the Federal Government is spending over 180 times as much on research in the health area as it is spending for crime research. Unfortunately, the sad comparison does not end with health research. The research budget of the Department of Agriculture this year is approximately \$139,468,000, 19 times greater than the amount spent on crime research and the Department of Interior research budget of \$129,707,000 is 18 times greater than the Federal budget for crime prevention and control.

We must reverse this trend and revise our list of priorities. We must bring the fight against crime into the 20th century.

Our law enforcement personnel are still largely dependent on 19th century weapons and procedures to fight the sophisticated techniques of the 20th-century criminal. The possible application of space age science and communications technology to police work is boundless. Yet the practical application of this advanced science and technology to police work is undoubtedly one of the most neglected aspects of current public safety programs.

Two recent incidents in my South Bronx constituency are indicative of the need I am citing here today. In one incident an innocent bystander was wounded in an exchange between police and a holdup man. In another incident a 12-year-old boy was shot by a policeman while trying to escape from a stolen car. In both of these very unfortunate incidents the patrolman was only doing his duty, but the result in each case was a very serious physical injury, as well as a potential riot-producing situation. It is unlikely that either of these serious injuries would have occurred if the New York police had had at their disposal a gun that would stun or temporarily disable, but not kill.

The saddest part of these two incidents is that neither is unique nor isolated. Innocent bystanders and youthful offenders are all too frequently the unfortunate victims of a deadly weapon used in the pursuit of the public safety. We owe it to our patrolmen on the beat and to the citizens who walk our streets to provide our police with the best possible equipment with which to do their job. It is inconceivable that a nation which is about to land a man on the moon at the cost of untold billions of Federal tax dollars cannot provide its law enforcement personnel with more efficient weapons than they use today.

The application of space age technology is by no means limited to law enforcement personnel alone. Over this past weekend New York City was victimized by a series of taxi cab holdups, a common event in many American cities. It is well within our current technological capabilities to provide taxi cabs with an instant emergency detection device. We also have within our current capacities the ability to provide law enforcement agencies with instantaneous identification of fingerprints and with immediate data on stolen automobiles via closed-circuit television. These are only a few small examples of the potential applications of current technological advances to police problems.

But the problem of crime in this country requires more than the development of better weapons and better police methodology, as important as these are. The National Institute of Crime Prevention and Control would also carry out an extensive program of behavioral research into the causes of crime, into the effectiveness of various means of preventing crime, and into cost-benefit techniques for reducing recidivism among those released from correctional institutions.

Every survey I have made of my own Congressional District in the South Bronx has shown that neighborhood security is the most critical concern of the

residents in this area. This anxiety is not unique. People in our major cities across the country as well as in rural areas live in fear of becoming the targets of unrestrained criminal activity.

Police chiefs throughout the country, in response to my recent inquiry, have stated that the lack of adequate research funds is a universal deficiency. Most of our State and local governments have virtually no funds to devote to research activities and where funds do exist the lack of coordination is virtually universal. Criminologists, sociologists, and jurists have likewise pointed up the lack of adequate funds for the large-scale research and demonstration projects that are needed to provide us with better information into the causes of crime as well as for testing existing theories of how to prevent criminal activity.

I expect that the National Crime Commission will soon be issuing its long-awaited report, and I am confident that these findings will serve as a valuable guide for an all-out attack on crime in America. The President has also promised in his state of the Union message that he will send to Congress this year a safe streets and crime control bill. Congress has already taken an important step in this area with the passage of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, which was definitely a step in the right direction.

Grant-in-aid programs to local police departments, however, will not solve the problem of inadequate research into weapons technology and criminal behavior. No one would ever have expected State and local grant-in-aid programs to produce a Manhattan project, a supersonic transport, or a Telestar satellite. Why then should we place the enormous burden of the types of research that I have discussed today on our State and local governments?

The National Institute of Crime Prevention and Control would provide the basic research tools, the funds, and the expertise to improve the work of those involved in reducing crime. Communities across the Nation are desperately looking to the Federal Government to attack this problem which can only be solved with the commitment of substantial Federal funds and strong Federal leadership.

CONGRESSMAN STRATTON INTRODUCES BILL TO CONVERT FOUR NATIONAL HOLIDAYS INTO 3-DAY WEEKENDS, AS IS NOW DONE WITH LABOR DAY

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced legislation in this Congress, as I have every year since I first came to this body in 1959, to shift the designation of four of our major na-

tional holidays which have no religious bearing so that each year they will automatically provide the basis of a 3-day holiday weekend, as is now done only in the case of Labor Day which falls regularly on the first Monday in September.

My bill, H.R. 1292, would reset Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, and Veterans Day so that, like Labor Day, they too would always fall on a Monday. Because of their religious or semireligious significance, however, no change is proposed in Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, or New Year's.

Under my bill Washington's Birthday would fall on the third Monday in February rather than automatically on February 22, Memorial Day on the last Monday in May rather than May 30, Independence Day on the first Monday in July rather than automatically on July 4, and Veterans Day on the second Monday in November rather than November 11. In this way each of these holidays would make possible a 3-day weekend every year, which happens now only infrequently. When these holidays fall in the middle of the week, as Washington's Birthday falls on a Wednesday this year and Memorial Day and Independence Day fall on a Tuesday, they make a long weekend impossible unless of course one chooses to stay away over 1 or 2 additional business days.

This proposal, Mr. Speaker, has two important advantages:

First. The 3-day weekend would make more time available for family vacation trips and outings over these holidays, which cannot be done so easily when the holiday is observed on a single day in the middle of the week.

Second. It would reduce the absenteeism and disruption on adjoining days which business and manufacturing plants report always occur when holidays do fall in the middle of the week, and people try to stretch the holiday observance into a 4- or 5-day weekend anyway.

Although I have introduced this legislation for the past 8 years, I believe chances for enacting it are far more encouraging in this Congress than they have been before. The first reason for this is that a survey taken last fall by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce revealed that 85 percent of those responding favored establishing these holidays on Mondays, in line with the provisions of my bill. In addition to that, the national Sunday supplement, *This Week*, has just conducted a nationwide poll from its readers on the same subject and has come up with an overwhelmingly favorable response. In fact officials of *This Week* inform me that the mail ballot response to their article was the greatest they have ever received. They tell me that they already have on hand 21 mailbags of replies, estimated to total more than 100,000 votes. Preliminary samples indicate about 90 percent of those replying favor my recommendation. *This Week* officials told me they were themselves amazed at the size of the favorable response.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that objections have been expressed to my bill, chiefly two which I would like to deal with here briefly:

First, some people feel there is something not quite proper in celebrating Independence Day on July 5, let us say, rather than July 4. But the fact is the Declaration of Independence was signed over a period of almost a year, beginning on July 2. The designation of July 4 as Independence Day was thus a fairly arbitrary decision. Similarly, Memorial Day, which originated in my own congressional district in Waterloo, N.Y. in 1866, was first observed on May 5. Veterans Day now commemorates veterans of all our wars not just of World War I, which ended on November 11.

The second objection most frequently mentioned is that if we had more 3-day weekends the traffic death toll would be much higher. But statistics of the National Safety Council actually demonstrate that the traffic death count for single-day holidays falling within the middle of the week is far higher than for any single day of a 3-day weekend. The obvious reason is that families often try to get in a long trip even over a 1-day holiday, but the pressure of time and increased fatigue result in a higher accident rate. On the other hand, with 3 days instead of 1 in which to make the trip, drivers proceed at a somewhat more leisurely pace and the total traffic death toll is therefore less than for an ordinary weekend plus a 1-day holiday.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the results of the surveys by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and This Week clearly indicate the public recognizes that the advantages of my legislation far outweigh the supposed objections. I believe that my bill should be considered and enacted promptly, so that the difficulties created this year by so many of our national holidays falling in the middle of the week will not occur in the future. I have called on the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to schedule hearings as soon as possible and I hope that this can be done. I invite the support of all my colleagues.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a copy of H.R. 1292:

H.R. 1292

A bill to provide for uniform annual observances of certain national holidays on Monday

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) each of the following holidays shall be observed as a holiday in each year as follows:

(1) Washington's Birthday on the third Monday in February.

(2) Memorial Day on the last Monday in May.

(3) Independence Day on the first Monday in July.

(4) Veterans Day on the second Monday in November.

(b) Each law of the United States in effect on the effective date of this section, which refers to any holiday named in subsection (a) of this section, shall be held and considered to refer to the day prescribed for the observance of such holiday by such subsection (a).

(c) All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this Act are modified and superseded to the extent necessary to eliminate such inconsistency.

Sec. 2. The foregoing section of this Act shall become effective on January 1 of the

year following the date of the enactment of this Act.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO REQUIRE ALL INSURED BANKS TO CLEAR CHECKS AT PAR

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today, I am happy to join my distinguished colleague from California, Hon. RICHARD T. HANNA, who is a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, in introducing legislation which is long overdue on the statute books. My bill would require all banks whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to pay all checks drawn upon them at par.

Many banks presently make exchange charges. They refuse to honor their outstanding checks at full face value. This is an abominable practice, Mr. Speaker, and the evil results are crystal clear and undeniable. Checking accounts represent the great bulk of our money supply, and exchange charges are thus no different from clipping dollar bills or coins. It interferes with the free functioning of our banking system and affects interstate commerce. Exchange charges are much more than a mere inconvenience. Millions of dollars annually are involved. This borders upon financial extortion.

The banks which make exchange charges refuse to redeem their own obligations at par and benefit at the expense of the customers of all the other banks which live up to their obligations. Millions upon millions of the banking public are subsidizing the customers of the "nonpar" banks. Nearly all our banks now clear their checks at par and this exchange practice is evil, reminiscent of the days of "wildcat banking."

Banks which enjoy the benefit of a banking system behind which is the strength of the U.S. Government should no longer be permitted to interfere and impair this system by "clipping" their checks and "clipping" the public.

RESOLUTIONS IN BEHALF OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the resolutions recently adopted in Texas by the United Automobile Workers Texas Leadership Council bespeak the mind of all Texans. I take pride in asking unanimous consent that

these resolutions be printed in the RECORD at this point. I also take this opportunity to congratulate the Texas UAW and my great friend and fellow Texan, H. A. Moon, the area director, for his thoughtfulness in making them available to me. They follow:

RESOLUTION OF TEXAS UAW LEADERSHIP COUNCIL

Whereas President Johnson's domestic and foreign policies merit the support of every American and

Whereas we, the assembled representatives of 25,000 UAW members in Texas, pledge our unwavering support of the President's program to strengthen freedom at home and abroad and

Whereas the achievements of the Johnson administration are many and great and his courage in leadership has moved the nation to recognize the long neglected weaknesses in our society and to chart solutions. And with strong voice he has told the world that Americans are determined to assist the weak and the menaced in other parts of the world in their struggle to win and maintain freedom and

Whereas we deplore the recent snide attacks on the President. The late Sam Rayburn often reminded us that any President who helped the poor and oppressed was destined to be the target of such attacks, citing Presidents Jackson, Lincoln, Roosevelt and Truman. History now adds President Johnson to that list.

Whereas the late President John F. Kennedy made the judgement that Lyndon B. Johnson should be his running mate. The voters of the nation overwhelmingly reaffirmed that judgment in the 1964 elections.

Therefore be it resolved that the representatives of the UAW membership in the State of Texas are unanimously in support of the President's legislative goals and foreign policies, and that we voice our pride in him as a man and as one of history's truly great Presidents.

Adopted unanimously at Texas UAW Leadership Council meeting, January 16, 1967, Driskill Hotel, Austin, Texas.

1. Permanent voter registration. No one in a democracy should quarrel against a voting system which affords the fullest participation by all citizens. Organized labor favors a system of permanent voter registration, without fee. Registration should be by party affiliation and enrollment periods should be of sufficient duration before each primary and general election that no citizen could be deprived of the opportunity to register.

2. Single districts for State legislators. State legislatures should be composed of members from single districts. This would bring our state government closer to the people, and would prevent one economic group or any other group from dominating an entire county. It would drastically cut the expense of legislature campaigns.

3. Job safety bill. Texas is the only major industrial state without safety protection for its working people. It naturally follows that Texas has the highest injury and death rate among working people on the job. Organized labor has long pushed for protection on the job. Such legislation is not pro-labor or pro-management, but is definitely pro-worker.

4. Unemployment compensation. Benefits paid to Texas workers hit by unemployment are among the lowest in the nation, and state eligibility and disqualification rules are among the toughest. Organized labor favors higher payments and more realistic rules governing eligibility and disqualification.

5. Workmen's compensation. Again, benefits paid to Texas workers injured on the job are among the lowest in the nation.

Organized labor favors substantially higher benefits.

6. Right-to-work. Organized labor and enlightened management are opposed to restrictions on collective bargaining typified by state right-to-work laws made possible by 14b of the Taft-Hartley Act. Labor Unions may be decertified by the National Labor Relations Board for refusal to represent all workers in a bargaining unit whether or not they are members of the Union. Thus Union members must use part of their dues to afford non-members with contract protection against discharge, misclassification, discrimination, etc.

7. Minimum wage law. The Federal Congress has established minimum wage protection for all workers engaged in interstate commerce. Organized labor believes strongly that workers not protected by Federal standards should be afforded protection by the individual states.

8. Anti-discrimination law. We believe that the individual states should enact laws prohibiting any form of discrimination (such as race, color, creed, religion, sex, etc.) in employment and promotional opportunities.

9. Schools. We believe the Founders of our State Constitution, when they talked of free public schools, were advocating just that—Free Schools—Elementary, Junior High Schools and Colleges—At all levels. The position of the UAW is that the only way to eliminate ignorance is through higher education.

10. Teachers' pay. We believe our school teachers—elementary, junior and high school—should be paid equivalent to at least the highest paid skilled workers in our plants and factories; and that our college professors should be paid in line with Junior Executives in our plants and factories. There is no greater commodity than the youth of our State, and in order for the schools to turn out students who will be the better citizens of tomorrow, the best qualified teachers must be provided for them. To attract the best salaries must be raised to a level commensurate with salaries of private industry.

11. State department of labor. We believe there should be a State Department of Labor that has authority, backed up by statute, that will give meaningful protection to the working people of our State.

12. Insurance laws and loan sharks. We believe that the Legislative and Executive Branches should take a long hard look at the Loan Sharks and Insurance Laws of this State. There should be a maximum ceiling on interest—not to exceed 10%. Our Insurance laws should be revised wherein they would create genuine competition among insurance companies.

13. Crime. We believe that more can be done to eliminate crime in this State, and that the State and Local police should receive better pay. Untrained and unfit police should be eliminated. We should have laws imposing severe penalties for brutality in the police forces of this State.

U.S. MEDICAL FIELD SERVICE SCHOOL URGENTLY NEEDS FACILITIES

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, ever since the 1700's San Antonio has been a city of military activity. The Spanish Viceroy who governed the Southwest at the turn of the 18th century believed

that a garrison at the headwaters of the San Antonio River would serve very well as a place from which to mount frontier exploration, and to protect settlements of the King of Spain. So it was that in San Antonio a presidio was built. A hundred years later one of these combination fortresses and churches was the scene of a battle in the Texas revolution—the Battle of the Alamo. In the latter part of the 1800's the U.S. Army restored the Alamo and used it as a quartermaster depot. Troops were garrisoned along the San Antonio River, but they were later moved to the place where Fort Sam Houston stands today.

Fort Sam Houston started as a cavalry garrison. The troops stationed there protected the city of San Antonio against Comanche raids, and the border against depredations from Mexico. Today, this post is the headquarters for the 4th U.S. Army and site of many vital military activities. Among other things, Fort Sam Houston is the home of the U.S. Army Medical Training Center. This Center is the place where every soldier in a medical career field receives his basic medical instruction. This is where battlefield medics are trained, and where research is done on ways and means of saving lives by bringing sophisticated medical care closer to the frontlines. Techniques developed at Fort Sam Houston are responsible for our being able today to have a man in an air-conditioned operating room within 15 minutes or so of being wounded in battle; and it is responsible for developing the medical techniques that reduce our battle deaths to 1 percent or less of casualties who actually receive medical treatment.

When a soldier is wounded or injured, three things become vital: aid on the spot, speed in moving him to trained surgeons and readily available hospital equipment. The final requirement is filled by portable hospitals; the second is filled by helicopters; and the first is filled by medical aid men. I submit that our troops' lives depend upon the courage and skill of medical aid men, whose job is to keep wounded men alive long enough to get them to treatment.

Mr. Speaker, those men must be trained, and their training takes place at the Medical Field Service School.

Today, the Medical Field Service School is operating in old and inadequate facilities. I have inspected those facilities myself; it is a tribute to the skill and dedication of the Army that training can take place in these facilities as well as it does. The Medical Field Service School is using no less than five old barracks that have been converted to classroom and demonstration use. They were never intended for this purpose. Troops are being forced out of these barracks and into old quarters that should not be in use at this time.

Congress in 1965 authorized the expenditure of \$8.3 million to furnish the facilities that the Medical Field Service School so urgently needs.

I believe that favorable consideration is required at an early date, so that this project can get underway. I urge my colleagues to support the work of this school by approving the funds that it

needs. If we fail to approve this request, we will be failing the men upon whom our soldiers must depend for their lives, if they fall victim to the bullets, mines, or traps of the enemies they face.

FEDERAL MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE GUARANTY CORPORATION

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation. Identical legislation is being introduced in the Senate.

The bill would create a Federal corporation to compensate policyholders and accident victims in cases where automobile insurance companies become insolvent. The corporation would protect citizens much as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation protect people with deposits and savings accounts.

The need for such legislation has been apparent for a long time. In the last 6 years, 73 companies writing motor vehicle liability insurance have been placed in liquidation and receivership. Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Committee investigations conducted in May 1965 revealed that most of these insolvencies were caused by carelessness or by specific acts of management dishonesty.

The human suffering these insolvencies have caused are staggering. Currently, there are some 300,000 unfortunate policy holders and accident victims, many of whom have been seriously injured, seeking an estimated \$600 million in claims out of net collectable assets of \$25 million. Obviously, these claims will be settled for far less.

Something must be done to protect the poor and others considered to be high auto insurance risks. Most of them have no choice but to deal with these fly-by-night auto insurance companies, and ultimately find themselves unprotected when it comes time to collect.

Of the 73 auto insurance companies which became insolvent in the last 6 years, half of them wrote policies in States other than those in which they were chartered. Thus, Federal legislation appears to be the only effective way of getting to the heart of the problem.

These are the main features of the bill:

First. Its basic purpose is to guarantee the contractual performance of insurers issuing policies of motor vehicle insurance in interstate commerce, and it also provides coverage for insurers issuing policies only in the State in which they are chartered, if they wish to apply for guarantee status.

Second. Any insurer whose policies are guaranteed by the Corporation shall include a statement in each policy to that effect.

Third. Once any insurer whose policies are guaranteed is declared insolvent by the final decision of the appropriate court, the Corporation shall assume and perform all the obligations of the insolvent insurer.

Fourth. The Corporation would have broad examination powers to examine insurers making application for guarantee status and those insurers whose policies are guaranteed.

Fifth. In carrying out its examination functions, the Corporation should coordinate its efforts with the appropriate State supervisory authorities and with the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

Sixth. A fund consisting initially of \$50 million capitalized through the Treasury, to be repaid, would enable the Corporation to be self-supporting by means of a nominal semiannual charge of one-eighth of 1 percent of each insurer's net direct premium writings. All administrative costs of the Corporation, including those of examinations, would be borne by the fund.

I believe that this legislation would go far to reduce both the frequency of auto insurer insolvencies, and the magnitude of financial loss suffered by policy owners. I strongly urge that we take this first important step to protect buyers of automobile liability insurance.

A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, PROVIDING ADDITIONAL \$600 PERSONAL EXEMPTION FOR THE WORKING COLLEGE STUDENT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional \$600 personal exemption for the student who is working his way through college.

We may well reflect with pride on the legislation we passed in the 89th Congress to provide financial assistance for a college education. The new guaranteed loan program, work-study funds, educational opportunity grants, and the National Defense Education Act loans were our major contributions toward opening up educational opportunity for all qualified young people.

Yet we cannot pretend that our work is finished and that we are now providing the means for a college education for all. Consider the guaranteed loan program, for example, whose implementation depends to a large part on the willingness of financial institutions to participate. Because of the well-known tight-money squeeze, preliminary reports indicate that this program has not received the wholehearted acceptance on the part of lenders that we had hoped for, and that the 6-percent interest rates guaranteed by the Government are not

as attractive as the much higher returns being realized on personal loans. With loan funds in short supply, it is predictable that many students will not be able to avail themselves of this program.

Nor are the National Defense Education Act and other assistance funds unlimited. Therefore, I am reintroducing the bill which I also sponsored in the 89th Congress to provide a deserving incentive to the working student who makes his own effort to meet the costs of education. Scholarship and loan funds may not be adequate, even though they are available, or the student may choose to avoid a loan because of the immediate financial obligation to begin repaying it. I firmly believe that we should encourage individual initiative and make sure that this type of student is not overlooked in our general aim to provide financial assistance. My bill will allow the working student to earn approximately \$1,500 a year tax free, which is not much when we consider the rising costs of college fees. In the 1964-65 school year, the average cost of attending a public college was \$1,560, an increase of 30 percent from 10 years ago. In the same academic year, the student attending a private college or university paid an average of about \$2,370—a 40-percent jump from the \$1,700 average cost of a decade ago. Furthermore, these expenses will continue to rise as institutions of higher education are forced to raise fees to meet their operating costs. Statisticians predict that the cost of a college education will go up by an estimated 50 percent in the next 10 years.

I might point out also that we provide tax relief for interest on home mortgages, flood damage, health expenses, and a variety of other special situations. Why should we not consider the education of our youth as much in the national interest by providing a tax incentive, at least for the working student? Many tax-credit bills have been introduced in past sessions but have drawn the disapproval of the executive branch, which opposes them on account of the consequent loss of tax revenues. It seems inconsistent that this same administration endorses the loan programs, for these are direct cash outlays and similarly a drain on revenues.

It is the responsibility of this Congress to seek out those avenues of assistance for our youth to enable them to fulfill their educational goals. We have provided students with scholarships and loans. We know that in most cases this is not enough to maintain the student in school, pay for his food, housing, and other expenses. We know that many of them must work in order to meet these costs. Certainly the Government should be willing to adopt a policy which seeks to encourage these students to self-help. Thus far we do not recognize these working students. My bill is only a modest attempt to grant them a tax advantage which will encourage many to retain part-time jobs knowing that everything they earn up to approximately \$1,500 will be tax exempt.

The approach of allowing deductions for college expenses, books, and tuition, is, of course, much broader in coverage and therefore more liberal in application.

It does not, however, meet the problem which my bill seeks to alleviate. Most students who do work while going to college would not be helped greatly by deductions for expenses alone, for many are nontuition paying and are in college on scholarship programs and would not have allowable deductions, for the expenses are not out-of-pocket. The cold war veteran, whose tuition is paid for by the Government and who must work, will also not be helped with only a deductible provision for expenses.

I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring legislation that I am convinced will keep many working students in college. The types of jobs which are ordinarily available to such individuals are not high salaried and thus cannot be expected to meet the annual increases in fees, books, and board that each student faces. I hope that the 90th Congress will continue to build upon the fine record of previous Congresses in the field of education, and I respectfully submit this bill as one steppingstone to our eventual goal of a college education for all qualified young Americans.

The full text of my bill follows:

H.R. 3980

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional personal exemption for a taxpayer who is a student

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 151 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to allowance of deductions for personal exemptions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION FOR TAXPAYER WHO IS A STUDENT.—An additional exemption of \$600 for the taxpayer if he is a student."

(b) Section 151(e)(4) of such Code (relating to definitions of student and educational institution) is amended by striking out "paragraph (1)(B)(ii)," and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (f) and paragraph (1)(B)(ii) of this subsection."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO PROVIDE THAT SERVICEMEN TRAVELING ON LEAVE, FURLOUGH, OR PASSES SHALL BE EXEMPTED FROM THE PAYMENT OF EXCISE TAXES ON AIR TRAVEL

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today legislation that would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that servicemen traveling on leave, furlough, or passes shall be exempted from the payment of excise taxes on air travel.

Taxes on transportation by rail or bus have been repealed in toto, whereas the

5 percent on air fares continues in effect. This means, of course, that the serviceman and all other persons who choose to travel by train or bus may do so without paying any excise tax. If, however, a member of our Armed Forces elects to fly so that he may have more time at home with his family or is forced to travel by air because of an emergency, he is required to pay the 5-percent tax on his ticket.

Because of our increased military obligations overseas, particularly in southeast Asia, the number of men and women in uniform has increased substantially during the last few years. The serviceman returning from Vietnam with a limited amount of time is dependent in most instances on air transportation. I believe we should try to lessen the burden of his service in every way possible, and one small, though significant, way the Congress could express its awareness and appreciation of his sacrifice is to amend the Internal Revenue Code to grant our military exemption from excise taxes on air fares.

I think the very least we can do is to extend to our servicemen who travel by air the same consideration we have given to everyone who travels by rail or highway.

Simply stated, I do not believe the few dollars in pay servicemen accumulate for recreation and visiting home should be taxed in any way when they are traveling on air transport.

FIRST ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF DIOCESAN DIRECTORS OF THE CONFRATERNITY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the 1960's are truly days of sweeping change—in religious reforms, educational awareness, and societal consciousness. It is altogether fitting then that a meeting which took place in Washington this week should be noted here in Congress. I am referring to the first organizational meeting of the newly formed National Committee of Diocesan Directors of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. The 23 Catholic priest-educators who attended the session are the elected representatives of more than 200 diocesan educators from every part of the United States.

I am particularly pleased to hail this meeting because the newly elected chairman of the committee is a close personal friend of mine, and one of the most outstanding priest-educators in the Diocese of Syracuse, N.Y., Rev. John S. Russell.

While we here in Congress are seriously deliberating the state of our na-

tional educational structure, our religious bodies are likewise underscoring their educational obligations—particularly in the field of adult religious education. This very field was high on the agenda of the Confraternity's National Committee. As Father Russell pointed out to his colleagues:

The present demands of religious education—especially continuing religious education for the adult—are so vast and so acute that only by a coordinated effort of all educational agencies can we hope to make continued progress.

Mr. Speaker, beyond the mere occurrence of this meeting there lies a greater significance. This newly coordinated effort is a direct result of the second Vatican council only recently concluded. In keeping with the spirit of the council, the national committee prepared a memorandum for the bishops' committee specifying, first, the members' concern for the upgrading of all religious educators; second, keen awareness of the need for collaboration of all agencies; third, indicating how the confraternity's religious education apostolate to the child and adult can be further perfected and strengthened.

It is important to note not only the coordinating nature of the committee but also its national complexion. Elected as officers to work with Father Russell were the Very Reverend John J. Scanlon, San Francisco, vice chairman; Very Reverend John L. Burton, Pittsburgh, secretary; and Rev. Joseph J. Brunner, Miami, treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the committee and pray for their success.

BILL INTRODUCED TO PROVIDE PERIOD OF ENTITLEMENT TO EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR VETERANS

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide that the period of entitlement to educational assistance for veterans shall be computed on the basis of 1½ months of entitlement for each month of service on active duty after January 31, 1955. At present, this subsection provides that it be computed on the basis of 1 month of entitlement for each period of service on active duty after January 31, 1955.

Under the original GI bill—Public Law 346, 78th Congress—the period of entitlement for World War II veterans was computed by adding 1 year to the total period of active service after September 16, 1940, and the period of entitlement of Korean conflict veterans under Public Law 550, 82d Congress—was determined by multiplying the active service performed after June 26, 1950, by one and one-half. In the case of the World War II veteran, the period of entitlement

could not exceed 48 months and for the Korean conflict veteran 36 months.

Although chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, provides that those with service after January 31, 1955, may have entitlement up to 36 months, I feel the conditions of service in the Armed Forces today are on a par with service in the forces during the Korean conflict—both under conditions of war. Therefore, if a grateful Government accorded the one group a program under one formula, the other group should not fare less.

In addition, since the current draft system favors the selection for military service of those who do not have sufficient means to attend a college or university upon graduation from a secondary school, the 2-year period of active duty performed should be the basis of educational assistance for 36 months—or 4 years of college level education.

UNENLIGHTENED TRADE STAND

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the Denver Post suggests clearing the air of outmoded viewpoints in considering President Johnson's proposals to broaden nonstrategic trade with Eastern Europe.

Unfortunately, the newspaper charges, the Republican leadership is pursuing a narrow, unenlightened position on the issue.

Eastern Europe no longer represents the monolithic bloc of the 1950's, the Post declares editorially. Other nations are increasingly asserting their political and economic independence from Russia.

Moreover, as the newspaper says, the blunt fact is that if we are unwilling to deal with Eastern Europe, other Western countries are more than willing to do so.

Presidents Johnson, Kennedy, and Eisenhower have seen the advantages of widening trade with that part of the world.

To help keep those advantages in sight, I ask that this editorial be made a part of the RECORD.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 19, 1967]

GOP'S TRADE STAND UNENLIGHTENED

In searching for a way of criticizing the administration's Vietnam policies, the Republican leadership in Congress is unwisely pursuing a narrow, unenlightened position on East-West trade.

Sen. Everett M. Dirksen, R-Ill., and Rep. Melvin Laird, R-Wis., in particular, have been ill-advised on the facts behind President Johnson's recommendations for broadening nonstrategic trade with the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries.

The GOP leaders this week were trying to marshal opposition to proposals for increasing trade with Iron Curtain nations that are providing military equipment for North Vietnam. Their main argument, reverting to outmoded cold war strategy, is that U.S. trade will strengthen the economies of the

Iron Curtain countries who, in turn, will be able to give more help to Hanoi.

This approach made sense in the 1950s when the Eastern European states were part of a monolithic bloc directly controlled by the Kremlin, and the flow of East-West trade was insignificant.

But in recent years, significant changes have occurred among and within the Iron Curtain countries. The "satellites" increasingly are asserting their political and economic independence from the Soviet Union. And, as a result, peaceful trade with the West—notably with Western Europe—has increased tremendously.

The blunt fact is that if the United States is unwilling to trade with Eastern Europe, other Western countries are more than willing to do so.

Thus, for example, if Congress ties the President's hands in a proposed multi-million-dollar machine tool deal for a Soviet auto plant, Moscow will merely take its business elsewhere in the West.

Three presidents—Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—have recognized the commercial and diplomatic advantages for the United States in widening our trade with Eastern Europe.

The war in Vietnam, of course, has distorted our foreign policy priorities, but it should not be permitted to halt the gains three administrations have made in opening "windows to the East."

We hope that the Republican leadership does not maintain a narrow, stubborn view on the trade issue, but instead listens to some of the voices of such progressive newcomers as Sen. Charles H. Percy, R-Ill., who last weekend publicly commended the President for promoting East-West trade.

NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS RETIREMENT AND OTHER BENEFITS

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined with Mr. HÉBERT and others in cosponsoring legislation to give our National Guard technicians retirement and other benefits where not provided by the States.

We passed a bill in the House last year but it was not acted on by the other body.

This bill will provide retirement and other civil-service-type benefits to these technicians who, in 31 States, have no coverage.

Under the bill all technicians not covered by State programs would be eligible for coverage. Those currently under State programs would be given an opportunity to come under the Federal program.

This legislation is long overdue. These people perform unique duties and their duty routine is unique in that though most work a 40-hour, 5-day week they are subject to irregular recall. In addition, these people are performing a vital role in our efforts in Vietnam through their support operations and I firmly believe it is time they were accorded first-class treatment as Federal employees.

BILL TO ALLOW TRANSFER OF PROPERTY KNOWN AS THE KENNEDY HOSPITAL TO THE MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BLANTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill that will allow the transfer of property known as the Kennedy Hospital to the Memphis State University, in Shelby County, Tenn. This property falls under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration and while I realize there is an established form for dispersement of surplus property, I would like to set forth the reasons I feel that in this case an exception is warranted.

Mr. Speaker, Memphis State University now has an enrollment of more than 14,000 students. The curriculum has been constantly expanding to meet the urgent and constantly growing needs of the student body. It is projected by the university that by 1970 there will be over 20,000 students. Memphis and Shelby County are one of the largest and most rapidly growing areas in America. Memphis State University is serving the MidSouth and is responsible for the educational needs of a majority of high school students of this area.

I feel it is imperative that the acquisition of this property be expedited to the fullest extent. The existing buildings can be utilized immediately and a professional plan has been designed toward the ultimate goal of new facilities blending in with existing ones.

Therefore, on reference of this bill to the committee, I shall desire to appear and request those who share my feelings to join with me and urge that the committee act expeditiously on this urgent and justified matter.

A like bill has been introduced in the Senate by Senators GORE and BAKER.

WE MAY ALREADY HAVE WHAT COULD BECOME AN OMBUDSMAN

Mr. ERLÉNBOURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], on Monday of this week, inserted in the Record a scholarly presentation on the concept of a congressional ombudsman embodied in his bill, H.R. 3388.

The question of how best to effectively deal with administrative and constituent problems is one which deserves the seri-

ous attention of this body. Mr. REUSS has proposed that this be done through a centralized office to be known as the congressional ombudsman.

A very convincing case can be made for the ombudsman idea and my colleague cited the warm praise his legislation has received in a book written by a most learned gentleman, Prof. Walter Gellhorn, a past president of the Association of American Law Schools and a member of the faculty of the Columbia University School of Law.

Of Professor Gellhorn's book, "When Americans Complain," Mr. REUSS cited for our perusal pages 87 to 94. Indeed, in these pages there is an approving discussion of H.R. 4273—89th Congress—for an administrative counsel of the Congress or congressional ombudsman.

What I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues today is more of Professor Gellhorn's book. I recommend the whole book, but wish to point particularly to those pages after page 94.

Professor Gellhorn recalls that a law enacted in 1964, but still not in operation, provided what—in his words—"might very possibly become a sort of American ombudsman." This institution, now on the books, is the Administrative Conference of the United States.

One wonders, of course, why there is no operating Administrative Conference in 1967 when it was specifically provided for in 1964. The answer is that the President has thus far failed to appoint a person to the 5-year chairmanship. Hence, we have no Administrative Conference and therefore what could be the initial step toward the creation of an ombudsman has not been taken.

Mr. Speaker, because of this body's clear interest in administrative and constituent problems, I ask that Professor Gellhorn's fine description of what we should expect of the Administrative Conference be included in the Record following my remarks.

I might stress one sentence of the Gellhorn discussion because it mentions parenthetically Mr. REUSS' proposal:

Enough has been said . . . to suggest that the Chairman of the Administrative Conference might very possibly become a sort of American Ombudsman for broad aspects of administrative functioning, while congressional casework (whether or not referred to the Administrative Counsel proposed by Representative Reuss) might continue to salve individual hurts.

I believe on this matter we would do well to review what already exists. The question of effectively dealing with the increasing volume of individual problems is one which we cannot ignore. But perhaps we would do well to inquire as to why nothing has been done with the Administrative Conference so that we might better chart a course for tomorrow.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Many years ago administrative lawyers urged that dissatisfaction with governmental methods and attitudes could be reduced if bureaucratic experience were pooled and then strained through the meshes of objective analysis. The Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, after

perhaps the first penetrating examination of all federal administrative rulemaking and adjudication recommended in 1941 the establishment of "a permanent organization to devote attention to the agencies' common procedural problems." The Committee well recognized that refinements of procedure and practice would be determined less by outside forces than by "the agencies' own sensitivity to the need for self-criticism and improvement." Still, these could be "stimulated by an organization especially qualified to perceive existing defects and suggest correctives."⁶⁰ The proposal was kept alive in various forms, notably through the efforts of the American Bar Association.⁶¹

Now, thanks to a statute enacted in late 1964 but not yet operative in mid-1966, opportunity exists to discover whether improvements really can be "stimulated by an organization especially qualified." The statute in question⁶² establishes the Administrative Conference of the United States, composed of the heads of major administrative bodies, other administrators, and persons who can broadly represent "the views of private citizens and utilize diverse experience"—practicing lawyers, scholars in the fields of administrative law and government, and others "especially informed by knowledge and experience." The Chairman, appointed for a five year term by the President with the Senate's approval, is to be compensated "at the highest rate established by law for the chairman of an independent regulatory board or commission," a materialistic indication that his post is taken seriously and that he is meant to be a man of distinction.

The Administrative Conference has been given a wide field of operation. It is to concern itself with the adequacy and fairness of the means used in effectuating any federal program that "involves protection of the public interest and the determination of rights, privileges, and obligations of private persons through rulemaking, adjudication, licensing or investigation." In that connection it can look at "any aspect of agency organization, procedure, or management which may affect the equitable consideration of public and private interests, the fairness of agency decisions, the speed of agency action, and the relationship of operating methods to later review"; but the Conference is not to address itself to the statutory scope of an agency's substantive powers or to policy matters that have been committed to its best judgment.

The Conference may make whatever studies it thinks desirable; information it needs from the agencies "shall be supplied to the

extent permitted by law." Then the Conference may formulate recommendations to administrative agencies (singly or en masse), to the President, and to Congress. Moreover, the Chairman is to report annually to both Congress and the President, and he may transmit to either or both of them additional interim reports he thinks might be useful. Thus the way is open to press hard for whatever may be needed to translate the Conference's opinions into acts.⁶³

The Chairman is the chief executive of the Conference. In that capacity he has been empowered, among other things, to "make inquiries into matters he deems important for Conference consideration, including matters proposed by persons inside or outside the Federal Government." And he is to be "the official spokesman for the Conference in relations with the several branches and agencies of the Federal Government and with interested organizations and individuals outside the Government, including responsibility for encouraging Federal agencies to effectuate the recommendations of the Conference."

Events and personalities are more influential than statutory verbiage in shaping reality. In this instance they remain as yet unknown. Enough has been said, however, to suggest that the Chairman of the Administrative Conference might very possibly become a sort of American ombudsman for broad aspects of administrative functioning, while congressional casework (whether or not referred to the Administrative Counsel proposed by Representative Reuss) might continue to salve individual hurts. The Chairman may freely inquire into "matters proposed by persons inside or outside the Federal Government," selecting those he believes might be "important for Conference consideration." A complaint by a particular pensioner that his benefit rate had been miscalculated would presumably not be in that group; inquiries in the pensioner's behalf, if made at all, would continue to be made by a congressman or, were he to exist, the Administrative Counsel. On the other hand, a report that a great many pensioners believed themselves to have been victimized by miscalculations might raise the question whether the Conference should look for flaws in existing decisional methods.

The Administrative Conference, in concept, has one particularly marked advantage over the ombudsman systems now in use abroad. That is the administrative agencies' direct involvement in recommendations affecting some or all of them. The Conference membership, heavily infused with important administrators and at the same time with professionally respected non-governmental figures, adopts whatever proposals it thinks will make for improved administrative methods. Views formulated by such a body—constituting, one might almost say, a specialized legislature—should carry very considerable weight. If those conclusions can be effectuated by direct action of the agencies, this is likely to occur with considerable frequency.

⁶³ No judicial or other review of Conference actions is contemplated by the statute. Like an ombudsman, the Conference can only recommend: it cannot command administrators nor change past decisions either to the advantage or disadvantage of private parties. If an administrative body regards the Conference's criticisms as unwarranted and its suggestions as unwise, it may simply ignore them. The Conference can then do no more than make public its views and their rejection. Appeals to reason are reviewed by those to whom the appeals are made, and no formal mechanism need be provided for that purpose.

quency.⁶⁴ If Presidential directives or remedial legislation be needed to bring them into force, they are likely to claim more respectful attention than if they were but one man's opinion. All of the existing ombudsman systems have exhibited a common weakness, namely, the ineffectiveness of the ombudsman's general proposals. When an ombudsman has dealt with a concrete issue, his recommendations have almost invariably been speedily adopted. When, however, he has sought to speak more broadly about administrative procedures, his thoughts have been received respectfully, but very little has then happened. Nor have proposals for legislation been conspicuously successful. The unfruitful outcome of most of these essays in reform may well be attributable to the ombudsman's isolation. He dwells alone on an eminence. His solitariness gives him a detached outlook. His freedom from governmental involvement fortifies public confidence in his objectivity. But isolation has its weaknesses as well as strengths. It encourages the supposition that an ombudsman, like a cloistered scholar, may be "too theoretical"—a pejorative phrase whose users seemingly feel no need to inquire further into whether the theoretician's views are sound. Moreover, an ombudsman has no testing ground, no forum in which a generally wholesome idea can be discussed until, by modifying it here and refining it there, it gains acceptance. When making a proposal to a particular administrative body about a specific issue, every ombudsman exchanges thoughts with the affected administrators before formally announcing his conclusion. He has less readily useful machinery, however, for similar exchanges when broader topics engage his attention. This weakens assurance that he has fully perceived and considered all ramifications of problems to which general recommendations may be addressed.

"This is not an entirely speculative assertion, for administrative agencies have made substantial responses to past advice. Many revised their procedural regulations extensively in the light of recommendations made in 1961 and 1962 by a temporary Administrative Conference of the United States, created by Executive Order of President Kennedy with functions and powers much like those now embodied in statute. The temporary Administrative Conference addressed thirty recommendations to particular agencies or to all; some were of large importance. See Selected Reports of the Administrative Conference of the United States, S. Doc. No. 24, 88th Cong., 1st Sess. (1963).

The Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure reported in 1941 (note 60 above, at 4) that even its preliminary discussions with administrative personnel had "stimulated agencies themselves toward the improvement of their own procedures. Some agencies, made conscious of procedural problems by the Committee's inquiries, have already substantially altered existing practices, either as a result of their own thinking or in accordance with informal suggestions of the Committee or its staff."

The two Commissions on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, commonly called the First and Second Hoover Commissions (1947-1949, 1953-1955), put forward 585 proposals of which 69.5 percent were adopted. Of those adopted, approximately two thirds were put into effect by direct administrative action. This information is derived from Dechert, note 56 (above), at 178, which in turn draws on data from Senate Committee on Government Operations, Summary of the Objectives Operations, and Results of the Commissions on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, Committee Print, 88th Cong., 1st Sess., May 1963.

⁶⁰ Final Report of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, S. Doc. No. 8 77th Cong., 1st Sess., 123 (1941). Shortly afterward a somewhat similar recommendation was made in New York, following a searching investigation of that state's agencies. See R. M. Benjamin, *Administrative Adjudication in the State of New York* 18 (1942).

⁶¹ Compare Boyer, note 57 (above), at 158-165.

⁶² 78 Stat. 615, 5 U.S.C. § 1045 (1964). For legislative background, see S. Rep. No. 621, 88th Cong., 1st Sess. (1963), H. Rep. No. 1565, 88th Cong., 2nd Sess. (1964). And see also "The Administrative Conference Act," 53 *Georgetown Law Journal* 457 (1965); V. G. Rosenblum, "Federal Legislative Activity: Appendix to Report of Committee on Administrative Law," 1964 *Proceedings of the Association of American Law Schools Part I* at 24; M. P. and A. N. Farley, "An American Ombudsman: Due Process in the Administrative State," 16 *Administrative Law Review* 212 (1964).

The Administrative Conference will not share that weakness. Whatever proposals may emerge from its discussions will reflect diverse experiences of "practical men," keenly aware that immobilizing governmental processes does not improve them. Moreover, the full-time Chairman will be discharging the responsibility, laid on him by law, of "encouraging Federal agencies to effectuate the recommendations of the Conference." Without constant fanfares of trumpets, a tactful Chairman could well offset the defeatist attitude that "mistakes, carelessness, delay, rigidity, and perhaps heartlessness" are bureaucratic inevitabilities. They need not be so if pains are constantly taken to assure proper organization, procedures, and above all spirit.

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM O. COWGER DISCUSSES URBAN POLITICAL POWER TODAY

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the most crucial problems our Nation faces is that of the growing urban areas, our rapidly expanding cities. It is not often that we hear a sound assessment of that problem and, in particular, the problems in the city where we now work, Washington, D.C.

When a former distinguished mayor of one of this Nation's larger cities discusses this problem, I think it would do all of us well to listen and learn. I would, therefore, like to include at this point in the Record the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM O. COWGER of Kentucky, before the District of Columbia Republican Executive Committee on January 25 of this year.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE WILLIAM O. COWGER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, THIRD DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY, LOUISVILLE, BEFORE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 25, 1967

I very much appreciate this opportunity to be with you briefly today and to discuss one of the compelling problems of America. President Lyndon B. Johnson has stated, "Our society will never be great until our cities are great. Today the frontier of imagination and innovation is inside those cities, not behind their borders." We are now in the very midst of the great urban revolution of the 1960's. In my opinion, the course of our cities determines the greatness of our nation. The list of problems facing municipal government is steadily increasing. We are faced with doubling the size and capacity of our present urban areas before the turn of the century. This means that we shall in effect reproduce in less than 40 years the urban physical plant which has been developed over a two-century period. The cost will be a staggering one, requiring an investment of between one and two trillion dollars.

⁶⁸ The quoted phrase comes from G. Powles, "The Citizens' Rights Against the Modern State, and its Responsibilities to Him," 13 *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 761, 773 (1964).

As a new Republican Member of the 90th Congress and a former Mayor of the City of Louisville, Kentucky, I share with all of you a concern for the trend that is evident here in Washington, D.C. I need not tell you that no city in the United States is in more dire need of municipal administration than this—the Capital of our country. Here we have located the White House, the Capitol Building, wide boulevards, magnificent monuments, and gleaming new office buildings. Over nine million Americans visit this city each year. They have found, as I have, that behind the broad tree-lined avenues, behind the beautiful and expensive Federal buildings exists one of the most depressing slum cities of America. The crime rate reaches higher each year and Americans are discovering that their Capital City is unsafe after dark: Nowhere in the United States will you find a more poorly organized and least efficient municipal government.

As a former Mayor, I look upon the poor municipal management of the District of Columbia as one of the outstanding failures of the "Great Society" under President Lyndon Johnson. The President and the National Democratic leadership are advocates of what they refer to as "Creative Federalism". This is a theory that the White House can direct all of the great society programs with efficiency and dispatch. But here in Washington, D.C., which should be a model for the "Great Society," we see a depressing failure of mismanagement. The municipal administration for Washington is directly under the jurisdiction of the White House. It is here that the President's anti-poverty program has been one of the great failures. It is here where urban development lags and stumbles. It is here where traffic is snarled beyond description and it is here where Federal aid to education is a failure.

It is my opinion, that we are now faced with one of the most critical periods in our history. Municipal government across the nation, and more particularly here in Washington, can no longer be hog-tied to a set of old crony ideas or blind alley solutions for the future. I submit to you that the facts of life in America are the urban facts of life. Nourish your community; help your community and you have helped and nourished the nation. Ignore the problems of the cities and you have ignored the problems of America. I feel that the Republican Party here in Washington has a perfect opportunity to exert the leadership necessary to lead this city out of the dark ages. I have been astonished to learn that here in the Nation's Capital where there has been a perennial clamor for home rule and voting representation in Congress that more than 60% of the eligible voters failed to go to the polls in the Presidential Election of 1964. With a concerted effort on the part of the Republicans of this community they could in 1968 help elect a President who would bring to an end the municipal mismanagement of your city. It is, therefore, important for us as a party and for you as individuals to begin the action now that would lead to victory in 1968. In addition to the mechanics of registering voters, we must be the party representing new ideas in the field of municipal administration. That distinguished jurist, Oliver Wendell Holmes once said, "I find the great thing in this world is not so much where we stand, as in what direction we are moving. We must sail sometimes with the wind and sometimes against it, but we must sail and not drift nor ride at anchor." The Republican Party has never had a better opportunity to chart a course toward victory in 1968. However, it must be a true course—one that offers answers and solutions to the problems of our cities. The urban areas of America are fertile grounds for recruitment to our party.

Certainly here in Washington, D.C. with the example of the Johnson Administration you have nothing but a bright future. But please remember that victory must be served as well as sought, served in terms of presenting a positive program, served with dedication, and above all, served in terms of good hard work.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE NEW BUDGET

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News of January 25, 1967, carried two provocative items concerning the Federal budget which require no comment. I include herewith the column by Ray Cromley, entitled "L.B.J. Budget Adds Up to \$700 More to Family's Cost," and the editorial, "The 1968 Deficit Statement," in the Record at this point:

L.B.J. BUDGET ADDS UP TO \$700 MORE TO FAMILY'S COST (By Ray Cromley)

President Johnson's budget, if enacted as is, will put stiff upward pressure on living costs for the average man.

When analyzed, the President's program, including hidden items and some juggling, shows an average living cost increase of close to \$700 for each family in the United States in the 15 months beginning about March 1 this year.

Vietnam war requests are up between \$15 billion and \$16 billion.

THE POOR AND AGED

Aid to the poor is up almost \$5 billion. Mr. Johnson says help to the poor will be close to \$26 billion in fiscal 1968.

Payments to the aged, including Social Security, will increase something over \$5 billion over and above the increased aid to the poor. Some \$4 billion of this will be the result of new payment schedules proposed by President Johnson in this budget message.

Housing, slum clearance and urban renewal, including the model cities program and increases in Federal mortgage insurance, are going to cost somewhat over \$2 billion more than in the past year.

Increased postal rates, aid to education, increased costs of the public debt and a host of other smaller programs will call for increases of between \$2.5 and \$3.5 billion.

WON'T BE ENOUGH

The proposed increases in taxes and postal rates are not expected to cover the increases in costs and spending, despite optimistic forecasts.

The result is likely to be continued increasing inflationary pressures.

The men who planned the budget are counting on the increases in Federal, military, Social Security, welfare and housing aid payments to stimulate the economy sufficiently to produce enough income to hold the budget deficit to \$3.8 billion for 1967 and \$2.1 billion for 1968.

The actual deficit will be closer to \$18 to \$20 billion total for the two years. (It is impossible to split the deficits between 1967 and 1968 because of Mr. Johnson's juggling of his budget figures.)

A study of Federal 1967 expenditures to date indicates that even with the increased

burdens of the Vietnam war excluded, Mr. Johnson a year ago in his message to Congress seriously underestimated what his budget programs would cost.

OVER BY \$4.3 BILLION

Excluding Vietnam, Mr. Johnson has now found that his 1967 programs cost \$4.3 billion more than he'd estimated they would. He says that \$3 billion of his mistake was due to the tight money market and \$1.3 billion a result of underestimating public assistance, Medicare and postal service costs.

Mr. Johnson says he underestimated Vietnam costs for fiscal 1967 by \$9.6 billion.

President Johnson has consistently underestimated costs in presenting his budgets to Congress. He thus has regularly had to come back to Congress for large supplements, not only for Vietnam (which is understandable) but for a variety of other programs as well.

This experience leads to the supposition that the President will again be back for sizable supplements next year. That is, based on his record, Mr. Johnson will spend this next 15 months at a faster rate than his budget calls for.

This greater than estimated spending will further increase the pressures on the economy and on living expenses for the average family.

THE 1968 DEFICIT STATEMENT

It used to be the budget makers in Washington made a stab at sending a balanced budget to Congress, at least on paper.

It was a risky business and usually didn't come out as calculated. (Since 1930, only six Federal budgets have wound up in the black.)

But at least the budgeteers gave the appearance of trying.

No more.

The last "balanced" budget was sent to Congress by President Kennedy for the 1963 fiscal year. He planned a year end surplus of \$463 million altho it turned out to be a deficit of more than \$6.2 billion.

The last year end surplus managed by Washington was in fiscal 1960 when President Eisenhower planned to spend \$1 billion less than income, and actually finished with a surplus of more than \$1.2 billion.

In the Johnson Administration, the deficits have been planned. Even talk of balancing the budget some day has vanished.

So, again for the 1968 fiscal year, Mr. Johnson is proposing a deficit—of \$8 billion this time.

As Mr. Johnson appears to see it, the answer is simple: Just raise the national debt to \$335 billion.

About everything in Mr. Johnson's deficit statement is a record of some type—record debt, record spending, record authority to spend more in the future, higher pay for Government employees, more employees (most since World War II), more for health, more for cities, more for welfare, more for interest on the debt (naturally) and even the same old wasteful subsidies for farms.

Before LBJ, the biggest year of Government spending was 1945, peak year of World War II. But nearly 90 per cent of that budget went to the war effort.

In World War II, the war had a priority on everything.

In this war, Mr. Johnson is proposing increases in non-war programs as well as war spending.

In short, he refuses to balance the budget. "The economy, the budget and the aims of our society," he says, "would be jeopardized by either a larger tax increase or by large slashes in military or civilian programs."

There is no jeopardy in giving the war, where Americans are dying, a top priority. There is no jeopardy in paying for whatever we do while we have the resources to pay. There is no jeopardy in testing Mr. Johnson's rash of programs for validity and usefulness.

The American economy, LBJ says, has "performed superbly" in recent years.

It has for sure. It has withstood the inflationary pressure of the rising Government debt—altho not so well lately. It has produced goods for war as well as a booming consumer market. It has endured tax incentives given and then taken away. It has survived the mountainous regulation and paperwork imposed by the Government. It has financed Government apparently on a permanent spending spree.

Question is: Can it do this forever? Mr. Johnson seems to think so.

Before it tinkers with Mr. Johnson's too little too late tax and postage increases, before it continues all of the unproven welfare programs he wants, before it agrees to ride the easy road to ever bigger deficit spending. Congress ought to think it over thoroughly.

Can we do something at once? And not pay for it? Who ultimately will pay up: Our great grandchildren, or our great great grandchildren? The interest on the debt is now bigger than the whole Federal budget of 1941.

U.S. AID TO POLISH COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week I introduced legislation to keep U.S. dollars from going to Castro via the United Nations Special Fund—dollars which would have been used for the training of Communist youths in electronics, radar, and military communications only 90 miles from our shores.

I would also like to take this opportunity to say that I am opposed to the giveaway to the Polish Communist Government. I find it incredible that the State Department proposes that the \$26 million in debts which Poland owes the United States for food shipments should not be repaid to the United States in dollars, but in Polish currency to be spent in Poland. This would, in effect, subsidize Polish Government shipments of industrial materials and goods to Cuba.

Only this month it was reported in the press that Cuba and Poland have signed a trade agreement by which Poland will supply food, consumer goods, and industrial and agricultural machinery to Cuba in exchange for Cuban sugar, rum, and minerals. If the State Department's proposal is accepted, it will mean that our supplies of food to Poland will allow Poland to supply food to Cuba.

It is inconceivable to me that at a time when Communist tyrants of Poland are openly supporting and assisting the Hanoi regime in North Vietnam, our Government can consider what amounts to simply giving that nation millions of dollars.

Late last year, a Hamburg newspaper dispatch noted that on one side of the harbor of Stettin, Poland, American wheat was being unloaded, while on the other side of that same harbor weapons to be used against American soldiers were loaded.

As long as the Polish Government is contributing to the export of Cuban

communism to the Western Hemisphere and to the deaths of our servicemen in Vietnam, I find any effort to give them economic assistance absolutely unthinkable.

Mr. Speaker, we must keep in mind the distinction between the oppressed Polish people and the Soviet puppets which rule them. The plan of our State Department to further subsidize the Polish Reds perpetuates them in power to the detriment of the Polish people.

The propaganda, by which Ambassador Gronowski was used as the mouthpiece, is poor policy for the United States, poor policy in terms of the welfare of our servicemen in Vietnam, and another blow to the aspirations of the Polish people for freedom.

In this legislative session there will be a number of specific occasions when we can come to grips with the misdirected foreign policy now being applied to the Soviet Union and its Eastern European satellites.

DESECRATION OF NATIONAL FLAG SHOULD BE FEDERAL CRIME

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, every time our national flag is publicly mutilated or trampled upon, we are reminded that there is no Federal law prohibiting such shameful incidents outside of the District of Columbia.

Last year there were several flag-marring incidents which received nationwide publicity, I, like all responsible citizens who learned of these deplorable activities, was thoroughly disgusted that an American would even think of desecrating the symbol of our freedom and proud heritage.

To deter and punish any further efforts to deliberately damage our national flag, I have today introduced legislation to make desecration of the flag a Federal crime, with punishment by imprisonment up to 5 years or a fine up to \$10,000, or both. This penalty is the same as that prescribed for draft card burners by a 1965 amendment to the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

I cite several examples where a public display was made of desecrating the national flag last year: An Illinois schoolteacher trampled on the flag in front of his class; demonstrators in Georgia pulled down the flag from courthouse grounds and proceeded to tear it, trample and spit on it; a speaker on a college campus in Indiana spit on the flag, then ripped it into pieces, threw it on the floor, and stomped on it; and a New York theater sponsored the burning of the flag on the stage.

At a time when our soldiers are engaged in a war halfway around the world, we, at home, should not hesitate to insure proper respect and protection for our national flag. Accordingly, Con-

gress should take favorable action on my bill at the earliest possible time.

RUSSIA: ENEMY IN VIETNAM

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the American people can fervently hope that Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara is not over-rosy in his latest evaluation of the Vietnam war situation. Over the years he has been all over the lot in his various appraisals. Of course, this time his statement that the North Vietnamese buildup is leveling off is tempered by his adding that his conclusions are tentative. So I hope this first public statement on the overall effects of the various phases of our recent military actions were not self-serving to justify administration policies.

Meanwhile, little is said by public officials as to the stepup of military assistance that Hanoi is receiving from the Soviet Union. I fear this strengthening of the enemy is being played down while the administration calls for greater trade and friendship with Moscow.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Representatives owes the American people a full and complete debate on the southeast Asia situation. How can public opinion be right without all the facts?

Mr. Speaker, the current issue of U.S. News & World Report has a most revealing article; it is entitled "Russia: The Enemy in Vietnam."

This article points out that Soviet Russia, not Red China, is the major enemy and that a steadily expanding Russian involvement is not told to the American people. Instead, high officials have pictured Russians anxious for peace.

With President Johnson having let down the bars on trade restrictions to Communist bloc countries, and having asked the Congress to provide guarantees and credit for increasing trade, the fact that the Russians are at war with us in Vietnam is ignored. I think, Mr. Speaker, the Congress should assure that all the facts are made public about Russian deliveries of strategic and military goods to Haiphong as reported by our intelligence sources.

THE COST-PRICE SQUEEZE ON FARMERS

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined Republicans from several other States in introducing a resolution

which points up the growing cost-price squeeze on American farmers.

It called upon the administration to stop using Government stockpiles and other tools to depress commodity prices. Farm costs continue to rise—at the same time the outlook for commodity price increases is blooming. In fact, indications of a decline in net realized income are ominous. With parity ratio at only 77, the farmers deserve every possible consideration. Certainly the Government should not manipulate stockpiles and sales policies in a manner which drives down prices. I am drafting legislation which will limit the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to dump stockpiles.

The full text of the resolution follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas the present administration is persisting in using American farmers and ranchers as scapegoats of inflation in spite of predictions by the Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture that realized net farm income will decline by at least 5 per centum during 1967; such decline being caused:

(1) by inflationary domestic fiscal policies which unduly increase farm production costs, such costs having increased 19 per centum since the year 1952; and

(2) by market price manipulations which have decreased prices received by farmers, such prices having decreased 6 per centum since the year 1952 with the result that the December 1966 parity ratio stands at only 77; and

(3) by failing to recognize that increased consumer prices have not been caused by farmers, such consumer prices having increased 17 per centum since the year 1952; and

(4) by the Secretary of Agriculture dumping huge quantities of grain upon the domestic market in order to break and depress grain, cattle, hog, mutton and lamb, and poultry market prices; and

(5) by the Secretary of Agriculture's expressions of pleasure with the fact that the prices of farm products had dropped in 1966; and

(6) by the Secretary of Agriculture's action to increase imports of raw sugar into the United States, such action being designed to lower market prices for United States sugar producers; and

(7) by stimulating the increase of wheat and feed grain production without providing adequate price incentives; and

(8) by a large and unilateral increase in Cheddar cheese and other dairy imports without seeking or attempting to secure reciprocal trade concessions from other nations to expand United States agricultural exports overseas; and

(9) by a sharp curtailment of purchases of pork and dairy products by the Department of Defense; and

(10) by permitting or condoning price and wage increases for other segments of the national economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity.

EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Commerce Department, which in my opinion has been caught up in a web it spun itself, apparently has felt compelled to issue a denial relating to my statement to the House of Representatives January 17, 1967, beginning page 685 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on the subject of East-West trade.

In going about this, the Department attempts to set up the all-too-familiar strawman by righteously denying that a list of revisions to the Commodity Control List published by the Department October 12, 1966, includes jet aircraft engines, diesel engines, and machine tools as items that may be shipped to the U.S.S.R. and other Eastern European countries without a validated license. The implication is that I stated or indicated that these items are included in that category.

An allegation along the lines of the Department of Commerce press release is contained in a statement by the gentleman from the 26th Congressional District of California [Mr. REES] which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 18, 1967.

Any charge or implication that I intended in my statement that the October 12, 1966, list clears jet aircraft engines, diesel engines, and machine tools for export to the U.S.S.R. and Eastern European countries without a validated license is completely without foundation.

The Department also denied that it misled the public in connection with its statements relating to its consultations with the intelligence community concerning decontrol of certain items for export.

For the RECORD, following is set forth a portion of my January 17, 1967, statement bearing on this matter:

Following President Johnson's announcement, the Department of Commerce on October 12, 1966, removed hundreds of commodities from the list of items requiring specific validated licenses to be shipped to other countries. The Department published a 68-page bulletin which provides a detailed listing of the items which now may be more freely exported, including the 400 items referred to by the President in the state of the Union message that can be freely exported to the Soviet Union and East European Communist countries.

And the Department of Commerce at that time issued a press release declaring to the American people that the items removed from the control list "fall into the category of peaceful goods, which may be freely exported without any risk to the United States national interests."

Also, the Department of Commerce asserted that the Department had "consulted with other interested departments, including Defense, State, Agriculture, Interior, and the Intelligence Community, in taking this step."

Something immediately seemed wrong, for though press preferences concerning the action seemed to stress only that decontrols on cereals and other food preparations were involved, it was obvious from a mere glance at the 68-page bulletin that many vitally important items were listed,

including such items as diesel engines, jet aircraft engines, machine tools, rifle cleaning compounds and other chemicals, and scientific and controlling instruments.

This raised the question: Could the Intelligence Community really have been consulted before these items were removed from export controls, particularly those who should be most concerned, the military intelligence agencies?

As is seen, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out step by step, inasmuch as the Commerce Department stated that the "intelligence community" had been consulted in connection with the decisions to place hundreds of items on the list of goods that could henceforth be freely exported to other countries, why in my opinion, it was necessary to check with the intelligence agencies on this point.

The reason for my concern, of course, is that policies adopted in this area have potentially far-reaching effects on our national security.

I therefore requested the heads of military intelligence organizations to describe whether the Commerce Department had consulted with their organization in connection with the October 12, 1966, revisions to the commodity control list. The document containing the revisions is identified as Current Export Bulletin No. 941.

For the information of the House I am again setting forth the text of letters from the chiefs of the service intelligence organizations and from the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency. These were also included in my January 17, 1967, statement. I invite careful attention to the letters, which follow:

DIRECTOR OF NAVAL INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, D.C., October 26, 1966.

Hon. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: The interim reply from my Deputy, to your letter of 18 October 1966, concerning Current Export Bulletin Number 941 indicated that my Staff would research the matter in which you have expressed an interest.

I can report that the Office of Naval Intelligence, definitely a member of the "Intelligence Community," had no part in the consultations which preceded the revision of the Commodity Control List. It can be further stated that ONI did not give its authorization for the removal of specific licensing requirements for the categories of commodities listed in Bulletin Number 941.

I trust that this information satisfactorily answers your questions with respect to the Office of Naval Intelligence.

Sincerely yours,

E. B. PLUCKEY,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C., October 28, 1966.

Hon. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: Thank you for your letter of 18 October 1966, and your inquiry into the recent revision of the Commodity Control List.

In response to your specific questions, I take this opportunity to inform you that no intelligence office of the United States Air Force participated in the revision of the Current Commodity Control List. I have no evidence to indicate that any other

United States Air Force agencies participated in this revision.

Sincerely,

JACK E. THOMAS,
Major General, USAF,
Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, OFFICE
OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., October 25, 1966.

Hon. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: This is in response to your inquiry addressed to Major General John J. Davis pertaining to the Department of Commerce Current Export Bulletin Number 941 and interest of Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence, United States Army (ACSI-DA), in selection of commodities approved for export to Communist Bloc countries.

The ACSI-DA was not consulted regarding the commodities listed, since the scope of interest does not include the intelligence aspects of strategic materials.

I regret I am not able to assist you in this matter.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND T. REID,
LTC, GS.

For J. L. BLACKWELL,
Colonel, GS, Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., October 27, 1966.

Hon. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: This letter is in response to your letter to General Carroll, dated October 18, 1966, which requests a description of the consultations of the Department of Commerce with the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) concerning Current Export Bulletin Number 941.

DIA does not participate in decisions on commodities to be deleted from or added to the Commodity Control List issued by the Department of Commerce. Intelligence concerning such items is provided by DIA, but not directly to the Department of Commerce.

Upon request of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs which represents the Department of Defense on these matters, DIA provides intelligence on the military application of commodities that might be of a strategic nature. However, DIA was not requested to supply intelligence on the 400 commodities that are covered in Current Export Bulletin Number 941.

Sincerely,

C. R. RODERICK,
Major General, USAF,
Director, Office of Legislative Liaison.

On the basis of these responses, clearly there is no justification to indicate or imply that the entire intelligence community had participated meaningfully in the deliberations.

In essence therefore the denial of the Commerce Department is a diversionary tactic, a smoke screen to try to obscure the issue and hide the fact that these intelligence agencies were not in fact "consulted" in any true meaning of the word.

Let it also be noted that the Commerce Department in effect is centering attention on the matter of goods that can be freely shipped abroad without a validated license. This is an important aspect of our trade control program. However, developments of potentially far greater significance are taking place in the area of shipments or proposed shipments

abroad that require validated licenses issued by the Department of Commerce.

When the bars are lowered on the granting of licenses authorizing the shipment of advanced equipment, goods, and technologies to the Communist bloc, as is occurring, this can have a highly significant impact on our national security.

Following is a listing of some of the licenses approved authorizing shipments to the Communist bloc in 1966. Some of the licenses were for commodities; others refer to technical data cleared for shipment:

U.S.S.R.: Airborne communications equipment; tin ore concentrating machinery; generator for electronic equipment used to control aircraft; silicone silicid boring machine; micro switches; oil seals; tire cord factory; instrument transformers; insecticides; herbicides; synthetic resins; organic chemicals; rubber antioxidants; chemical corrosion inhibitor; cellulose acetate butyrate; ball bearings; special purpose vehicle; magnesium oxide; mining equipment; diethylene glycol; ammonia factory; nitric acid factory; information on how to make foamed polystyrene; rubber compounding agents; methyl bromide; methyl pyrrolidone; methylene chloride; diethylene glycol; isobutyl alcohol; phenyl dimethyl urea; fingerprinting kits; lift truck; grinding machines and parts; construction equipment; ball and roller bearings; communications equipment; airborne navigation equipment; electronic computer and parts; electrical testing instruments and parts; electric motors and transformers; rubber processing machines and parts; diamond core bits; tungsten carbide bits; synthetic rubber; chemical woodpulp; ethylene chlorohydrin; oxygen analyzers and handling system; filtering and purifying machines; magnetic tape instruments and spares; liquid scintillation system and accessories; radiation measuring instruments; diesel engines and spare parts; steel tubing; statistical machines and parts; tires, tubes and flaps; relief maps; coast and geodetic charts; ammonia; nitric acid; urea; ammonium nitrate; nitrogen solution factories; glass envelopes for TV tubes; ethylene oxide; ethylbenzene; pulp mill equipment; waste gas disposal units; glycol evaporator; sodium chloride crystallization; chlorine dioxide; electrostatic precipitation; pyrite roasting and reduction; alunite processing equipment; styrene; polyethylene tubes; iron ore pelletizing; tin ore dressing tables; rotary earth digging augers; shankplates and digging teeth; carbon tetrachloride; fractional hp refrigerator compressors and cabinets; melamine; iron ore concentrates; ship stabilization system; petroleum coke; analgetic agent; pulp mill; synthetic Vitamin A; carbon tetrachloride and perchloroethylene glycerol; sulfuric acid.

Czechoslovakia: Ethyl cellulose; semi-conductors; synthetic rubber; ball and roller bearings; petroleum products; hydrogen plant; electric lift trucks; neoprene latex; electron tubes; instrument parts for measuring and checking temperatures; nuclear radiation detection and measuring instruments; synthetic rubber; methyl bromide; neoprene; resin; polyethane glycol; monoethylene glycol; methyl cellulose; nuclear radiation detecting and measuring instruments; nylon filament; mental valves and parts; ball and roller bearings; electronic computer system; polishing machine and converter; aluminum alloy; vanadium pentoxide; cellulose acetate butyrate; neoprene; isophthalic acid; rubber compounding agent; electrical measuring and testing instruments; nylon strapping; disk-file and parts; electronic computers and parts; pyrotechnical rocket engines; heat transfer oil; nickel alloy; woodpulp for rayon tire yarn; semi-conductors and resistors; transmitter radio

beacon and parts; glass fibers; pulp mill equipment; cold tube reducing mill; diamond wheels; carbon dioxide removal; atmospheric crude distillation, vacuum distillation and hydrosulfurization units; ethylene oxide/ethylene glycol; xyleneisomerization; hydrogen plant; para-xylene.

Rumania: Industrial instruments and parts; synthetic rubber; iron oxide catalyst; airborne radar, navigational equipment and parts; automotive replacement parts; petroleum drilling and production equipment; electrical testing instrument; signal generators; material and equipment for construction and maintenance of catalytic cracking unit; transceivers; diesel fuel; rubber antiozonant; iron oxide catalysts; petroleum and gas equipment; gas compressor and recorder; lubricating oil; samples of iron and steel; sheet glass and fibrous glass material; compressors; benzene; cold rolling mill; copper rod mill; acrylonitrile; carbon dioxide removal; blooming mill; ethylene/propylene; heaters for ethylene plant; polybutadiene/polyisoprene; detergent; pipeline centrifugal compressors; vinyl chloride; synthetic glycerine; ethylene dichloride pyrolyses furnace; polyvinylchloride; paraxylene; carbon tetrachloride and perchloroethylene; polyethylene; hot aluminum sheet mill; aluminum cold strip mill.

Bulgaria: Chemical analysis equipment; pumps and compressors; glass fiber factory; ammonia phosphoric acid factory; superphosphate factory; enzymes; catalysts; industrial equipment and parts; electrical and electronic equipment and parts; lubricating and fuel oil and grease; roller bearings; isobutyl alcohol; molybdenum catalyst; palladium catalyst; industrial chemicals; refining equipment and parts; metal cutting machine; airborne communications equipment; airborne radar (transponders) equipment; airborne navigation equipment; steel powder; sulfate crystallization; ammonia, phosphoric acid, sulphuric acid, nitric acid and complex fertilizer factories; sulphuric acid; hot dip tinning line; 2, 4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid; carbon disulfide; heat exchangers; turbine and generator; tires and tubes; electrolytic tinning line; automotive tires and tubes; iron ore pelletizing.

Poland: Copper cable; spectrum measuring instrument; styrene factory; hypoid generator and tooling; electrical steel sheets; electrolytic tinning and coil preparation line; components and tubes for electrical equipment; magnetic tape units; metal working and cutting machine and parts; computer equipment and parts; radiocommunication receiver and parts; coaxial cable; aromatics extraction unit; subcritical oil fired steam generators; glass fibers; aluminum foil; diesel engine valves; valves; steering linkages, ball joint suspensions, manual steering gears and piston rings; sulphuric acid; control and piston valves; fractional hp refrigerator compressors; grinding machine; aroma chemicals, polyethylene; benzene; high speed turbine-driven generators.

Hungary: Scientific and professional instrument parts; electron tubes; crankshaft welder; physical properties testing equipment; statistical machine parts; optical measuring and checking instruments; steel samples; vacuum gauges; cellulose acetate; ethyl cellulose; triethylene diamine; ethylene glycol; methyl cellulose; electronic navigational aids; digital computer; radiation detection and measuring instruments; airborne communication equipment and parts; micro switches; butanol (butyl alcohol); electronic computer systems and parts; nuclear-radiation detection and measuring instruments; metal cutting and working machines and accessories; diesel engine exhaust manifolds; electronic testing, measuring and recording instruments; railway equipment and parts; tire recapping and repair parts; metal samples; heat transfer oil; airborne navigational

equipment and parts; synthetic rubber; electrostatic precipitator; herbicides.

Yugoslavia: Copper scrap; semi-conductors; oscilloscopes; electrical measuring instruments; electronic computer parts; petroleum products; aircraft parts; communication cable.

East Germany: Gas chromatograph; machine for manufacture of polystyrene powder; nuclear radiation detecting and measuring instruments; boring and drilling machines; magnetic tape; data processing system; tractor shovel loader; electronic computer input/output device; virgin mercury; synthetic rubber; electronic computer with space parts; spectrometer system; lubricating oil; glass fibers; V-belt cord treating system; impregnating system for belt fabric; ethylene oxide/ethylene glycol; lime mud re-burning system; crude oil topping and coke unit; cold strip rolling mill and tandem temper mill; pulp mill equipment; cyclohexane; rotary combustion engines; air separation; dimethylformamide/methylamines; synthetic ammonia.

The entire field of export control is very much in need of congressional scrutiny and evaluation. For this reason I believe the creation of the House Select Committee on Export Control is essential. I have introduced a resolution for this purpose, House Resolution 67, and respectfully request support for this resolution.

AFTER THE KENNEDY ROUND, WHAT: NEW HORIZONS IN FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. ERLÉNBOEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 4½ years the foreign trade policy of the United States has been primarily concerned with initiating and bringing to conclusion the so-called Kennedy round of trade negotiations conducted under the mandate of the 1962 Trade Expansion Act. At the end of the day on June 30, 1967, the President's power to cut U.S. tariffs through mutually advantageous trade negotiations will expire. The United States will be faced with the task of fashioning a new trade policy and new trade legislation to implement that policy. Already there is much discussion about its nature.

During the period of our concentration on the Kennedy round many problems have emerged that have had to remain of lesser importance. They will now take center stage, and addressing these problems will constitute the essence of future U.S. trade policy. An article by Mr. William Diebold, Jr., titled "New Horizons in Foreign Trade Policy," in the January 1967 issue of the Foreign Affairs Quarterly, discusses these new areas of concern. Mr. Diebold, senior research fellow of the Council on Foreign Relations, identifies nontariff trade barriers, agriculture trade, and trade of less developed countries—LDCs—as major concerns of future policy.

In an article in the New York Journal of Commerce on October 31, 1966, I expressed my own views on what should occur after the Kennedy round. My observations are remarkably similar to those of Mr. Diebold. I agree that agriculture, nontariff barriers and LDC trade problems will be major concerns, except that I stress another area of commercial relations that relates to problems of industrial property, such as patents and copyrights. But Mr. Diebold is also concerned, as I am, about the role of huge transnational companies and their possible effects on national economic policies.

Mr. Diebold includes yet another area: trade with the Soviet Union and the Communist countries of Eastern Europe. This is a rather different policy problem—it does not come to our attention primarily as a result of the Kennedy round, and it is not likely to be handled in the context of legislation designed to cope with the problems of industrial, agricultural, nontariff, and LDC trade. Rather, trade with Communist countries is less an economic and more a political question than these, and Mr. Diebold recognizes the special circumstances of this element of trade policy.

A central idea in my article was that regardless of the outcome of the Kennedy round a period of reexamination should begin immediately after its conclusion and that a new set of trade policy goals should be formulated so that forward momentum and cohesion might be maintained. Mr. Diebold, too, seems to favor this approach. He does not seem to favor the idea, now gaining currency, that there should be a trade policy "detente" until 1969 and a new Presidential term.

To fashion a new trade policy and legislation will require leadership, leadership from the President and his delegate in charge of trade policy—the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. This post now lacks a permanent appointee. I submit that the President should appoint to this post without further delay a man of the ability to carry forward the work begun by Governor Herter, a man able to fashion a timely and informed new trade policy and an organization able to implement that policy.

With unanimous consent Mr. Diebold's article in Foreign Affairs and my article in the Journal of Commerce of October 31 follow:

[From Foreign Affairs, January 1967]

NEW HORIZONS IN FOREIGN TRADE

(By William Diebold, Jr.)

Unless there is new legislation, the President will, at midnight on June 30, 1967, lose his power to cut American tariffs in trade bargains with other countries. The situation is familiar enough. Eleven times already the country has faced the question of renewing the grant of power first made in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. Each time, Congress has prolonged the power, sometimes enlarging and sometimes reducing it. Mixing long-run policy and short-run tactics to get the best possible terms for the renewal of trade legislation is an old art in Washington. But this renewal is different.

It is different because if the Kennedy Round—the tariff negotiations that have been going on in Geneva for the last few years—comes out as it seems likely to, we shall be on the threshold of a period in which trade negotiations among industrialized countries will take on new forms and a greatly enlarged scope. Sooner or later, though not necessarily in 1967, the President will have to be given new kinds of powers to engage in trade negotiations: an extension of the existing ones to cut tariffs will no longer suffice. (And if the Kennedy Round does not live up to reasonable expectations, the issues involved in a 1967 renewal will look different again, but for other reasons.)

Though trade negotiations may not be quite as unpredictable as dice or cards, it is surprising how much agreement there is among those who have looked into the matter as to what may come out of the Kennedy Round. The main impact will be on trade in manufactured goods among the advanced industrial areas—North America, Western Europe and Japan. Some important products will not be touched but for many others duties will be cut in half (the largest possible reduction under American law, with a few exceptions). For still other goods there will be some kind of in-between cut, especially if one country has very high tariffs and another very low ones. Averaging tariffs is a questionable practice, but some brave souls find it reasonable to say that the total effect will be a reduction of tariffs amounting to perhaps 25 percent or, with luck, as much as 35. Something may also be done about non-tariff barriers, but for the most part this will be unfinished business, opening questions for the future.

Agricultural exports are important for the United States, but it is hard to see how anything more can be expected than tariff concessions on a few products, some temporary understandings about the course of trade over the next few years in some major products and the beginning of a serious effort to negotiate in quite new ways so as to mitigate the costly clash of national farm policies in the future.

All this sounds prosaic enough. Where are the new horizons? Only as we look at the problems that will have to be dealt with after the Kennedy Round does the new prospect unfold.

II

The tariffs that remain after the Kennedy Round will not be negligible, and any new legislation aimed at them will have to start by renewing at least the President's existing powers. But would another 50 percent reduction be worth the trouble of going through the mill of another massive multilateral tariff negotiation? Simpler ways can be found, provided, of course, governments are willing to make further cuts. For example, tariff rates might be reduced a certain percent each year. Or levels could be set to which all countries would reduce their duties on certain products, thus producing a degree of "harmonization" which many people feel desirable. Rules can be devised to allow enough flexibility to permit each country to move a little more slowly on its hard cases if it moves a little more rapidly on others, or to permit a country with low duties to reduce them more slowly than those with higher rates. Formulas are neither magical nor scientific, but one can see that a general rule of this sort would simplify trade negotiations and probably enhance their effect.

Tariffs on trade among the industrial countries have been reduced much more than is generally realized. Many are far lower than at any time since the depression or, in some cases, since the end of the last century. The United States has quite a few rates that are one-quarter of what they were in 1934 and many that are almost as low. Within the Common Market and the European Free Trade Area, tariffs will soon

disappear. If the Kennedy Round cuts duties by another quarter of a third, much of the world's trade in manufactured goods will move at tariff rates of less than 10 percent *ad valorem*, or not much more. Inevitably one asks, "If that much can be accomplished in twenty years without great disturbance, why not more?" Can the remainder not be removed in, say, another ten—gently, year by year?

This picture may, however, be illusory. The last quarter of a tariff may be what really protects, so that it would prove harder to remove than the first three quarters. A 10 percent tax can be very important in a highly competitive market; also, it may be equivalent to several times that much if what is being protected is only the cost of manufacturing, when raw materials are imported at low or no duties. (But then past cuts may also have been greater than they seemed.) An opposite view of things after the Kennedy Round would be that if tariffs are low enough they make so little difference to trade that they may not be worth the effort of removing. The evidence on all these points is limited and conflicting; generalizations are unwise. The fact of the matter is almost certainly that some low tariffs have a significant effect while others do not, and that negotiations will reveal more than analysis will about which further steps will be relatively easy and which very hard.

We can be sure in advance that governments will not be willing to apply simplified procedures for the reduction of tariffs to all their trade. Some of the hard cases might be attacked instead by a new way of negotiating that is taking shape during the Kennedy Round. Called the sector or industry-by-industry approach, it largely grew out of the fact that there was a danger of no significant tariff reductions being made in several major industries because one country or another wanted to hold out key products from the across-the-board cut of 50 percent. Consequently others were unwilling to make their best offers. So long as the approach was product by product, reluctance in the most timorous country blocked all action, often to the disadvantage of other parts of the same industry. In chemicals and steel, for instance, several major countries have both an export interest and a protected sector. By looking at each of these industries as a whole, the negotiators opened the possibility of working out balanced bargains covering tariffs and non-tariff barriers as well. Too little is publicly known as yet to make a confident appraisal of this technique. It suggests questions about relations between governments and businesses and among producers in various countries that will have to be looked at warily. Still it is noteworthy that Eric Wyndham White, the Director General of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, has suggested that this approach could provide a way of moving toward free trade in a number of industries, particularly those with large enterprises and fairly advanced technologies.

If that technique works in the hard cases, and deep cuts are made in other across-the-board duty rates, then the Kennedy Round will have opened the prospect of the elimination of tariffs on trade in manufactured goods among industrial countries. Free trade, so long an impossible ideal for some and a worrisome specter for others, will become, for the first time in nearly a century, something that can be seriously contemplated as a reasonable objective of policy. But the Kennedy Round has also made clear—if there was ever any doubt—that the removal of tariffs does not by itself produce free trade.

One of the advantages of the industry-by-industry approach has been to clarify the significance of non-tariff barriers in each industry and to help link their removal or modification to tariff changes. But no matter what technique is used, non-tariff barriers will have a prominent place in future trade

negotiations. So far as quotas and exchange controls are concerned, the question is largely one of enforcing existing rules. But large numbers of other barriers fall outside any agreed international code and present difficult problems. Their variety is great. Some devices enhance the effect of tariffs—for example, by using artificial prices to calculate duties and assigning goods arbitrarily to customs classifications with higher duties. There are suspected abuses of legitimate practices, as in the application of anti-dumping duties. "Buy American" laws are only the best-known example of the very widespread practice of discriminating against foreign goods in governmental purchasing. Some European countries have taxes that fall disproportionately on large (and therefore largely American) automobiles. Sanitary rules, marking and labelling requirements, copyright and trademark laws, and many other regulations may also have the effect of restricting trade. So do some private business practices. Sometimes restriction is a by-product of activities that have other major purposes, but many practices are undoubtedly subterfuge. How damaging each is, and to whom, are matters still in dispute.

These barriers are too numerous and too diverse to be dealt with in a simple, comprehensive way. Some would require detailed agreements; some might yield to a more general code; others will undoubtedly have to be dealt with case by case, or under some kind of complaints procedure. Concern with nontariff barriers is not entirely new, but the Kennedy Round has moved them to a new position of prominence and set them firmly on the agenda of future trade negotiations. As tariffs become less restrictive, non-tariff barriers become more important; and they affect the pace of tariff reduction as well. For example, European countries may link their reductions of duties on chemicals to the modification of the "American selling price" rule which has the effect of raising United States duties on some of their products. Other non-tariff barriers are likely to be treated in the same way in the future. What Percy Bidwell christened "the invisible tariff" is becoming more visible.

This prospect that the Kennedy Round has opened leads to another one. To start talking about non-tariff barriers is to open a subject that has no logical end. All manner of government activities undertaken for all sorts of reasons may have the effect of restricting trade, or at least of putting foreigners at a disadvantage compared to domestic producers. What is a trade barrier? When will it be brought into international negotiations? These are questions of new scope for the future. For example, border taxes related to domestic turnover taxes and the like have traditionally been regarded as not affecting foreign trade. Now that idea is being called in question, but the implication of change reaches deep into national tax structures and raises questions about exchange rates as well. And as tariffs fall, national laws and policies about prices, wages and business practices take on a new international importance. The foreigner's concern with depreciation allowances, shipping laws, government-financed research and the more recondite forms of subsidy grows. Only far in the future can one imagine international negotiations covering quite so wide a range of subjects, but much sooner there will be questions about these practices and others that influence trade negotiations.

Agriculture, for so long the bad boy of international trade liberalization, is already posing similar questions. For decades large segments of agricultural trade have not only been exempted from the general process of lowering trade barriers but have been subjected to new restrictions. More than simple protectionism and the political strength of farmers went into this process. Many of the restrictions were the logical consequence of domestic farm programs like those in the

United States which kept domestic prices above world levels and often sought to limit output as well. In the Kennedy Round the United States and other producers outside the E.E.C. found themselves faced with a complicated new agricultural policy applied to the whole Common Market. Close and ingenious attention had been given to working out its implications for imports with a degree of logical rigor that promised to create something very much like a self-sealing mechanism. For some important products the outside world seemed likely to be put in the position of being able to supply the Six only when their own production fell short. The effect was enhanced by an increase in production and productivity coming not only from the prices offered under the new policy but even more from a technological revolution in agriculture comparable to that which put the United States back into its historical position as a low-cost exporter.

There is no way out of this impasse if negotiations are confined to trade barriers alone. So long as countries adhere to policies of this sort, there is little hope of liberalizing agricultural trade except by agreements that affect the policies themselves, not just the tariffs, quotas and variable levies that support them. If there is to be progress at all, governments have to be willing to talk, negotiate and give undertakings about such things as price-support levels, subsidies, production control and the financing of surpluses, as well as about the regulation of imports. This awkward fact is widely recognized, but whether governments will be willing to act on these premises, will be able to reach agreement and will then be able to overcome the obvious domestic political obstacles to putting agreement into effect are questions which give some inkling of the difficulties of future trade negotiations. The most the Kennedy Round can do is to start the process—and it could fail in the effort.

Agriculture as a mid-sixties exemplar of future international trade negotiations is about as unlikely a picture as one could imagine. The reasons are peculiar to agriculture. The agreements that might be made are not at all like those to be sought in negotiations about manufactured goods. The position in agriculture has been reached through the impossibility of dealing with trade barriers in the conventional way, while in industry it results from success in removing them to the point where other barriers stand revealed. And yet the two have something in common: both indicate that the trade policy of the future, if it is to make progress at all, will entail international discussion, negotiation and perhaps agreement on a whole range of things normally regarded as domestic.

That conclusion is not quite as shocking as it may seem at first sight. Defense and its economic impact have been of mutual concern to the United States and its allies for a long time. We made the domestic economies of Europe and Japan our business from the end of the war on. It is not just our difficulties with the balance of payments that have given other countries reason to be concerned about American recessions, inflation, interest rates, wage policies and general economic health. From concern has come international discussion, sometimes negotiation and, in varying degrees, undertakings. National autonomy has not given way to international obligations but it has not been left immune either. So it is not surprising if trade, the biggest international economic nexus of all, should lead in the same direction.

At the same time that what was thought to be domestic is becoming of greater international concern, the international economy is developing in ways that raise questions about what is any longer national. Europeans and Canadians ask themselves whether American ownership of segments of their industries and American involvement in their

financial systems are denationalizing their economies. In underdeveloped countries some people who long ago thought they knew the answer to that question are now beginning to wonder if the expansion of the economy that is theirs to control does not depend in part on a willingness to accept more foreign enterprise. Oil-producing countries that are financially weaker than some of the companies that operate within their boundaries are finding ways to balance the seesaw while the international companies try to become good citizens of a dozen countries at once. Americans too have some questions. In 1964, manufacturing companies in Western Europe of which Americans owned at least 25 percent, and which they usually controlled, had sales equalling \$16.5 billion, over twice the amount of U.S. exports to Western Europe that year. The figures are not strictly comparable and they are obviously very different in their economic meaning, yet they raise questions. Can one fully understand the American trade interest in Europe by looking at exports alone? What is the relation of American investments to European trade barriers? More fundamentally still, what is the American economy? Clearly it is not just a geographical entity surrounded by a tariff and an invisible monetary line. Our foreign trade is not just something that crosses the customs frontier or involves the exchange of dollars for other currencies. But how to define the economy is not clear, and so there must be doubt about how to define the national economic interest as well. With the United States government and most foreign governments declaring, in common but for different reasons, their interest in American investment abroad, it takes no vivid imagination to see how the area of international discussion will broaden.

III

Broad as they are, these prospects opened by the Kennedy Round apply only to part of American foreign trade. The possibilities of free trade in manufactured goods, negotiations about national farm policies, greater attention to non-tariff barriers and the increasing international discussion of formerly domestic issues are relevant primarily to our trade with Western Europe, Canada and Japan. The third of our trade that is conducted with the underdeveloped countries and the less than 1 percent with the Communist countries present quite different perspectives.

Trade with the Soviet Union and the Communist countries of Eastern Europe has some of the characteristics of trade among the industrial countries of the free world, but not many. Its own peculiarities make it a realm in which different approaches are needed. This is not just a matter of the security control the United States applies to its exports to these countries. The far larger West European trade with the East still involves quotas, bilateral balancing and even barter. No one has yet found a satisfactory way of laying down a set of rules for relations between state trading bodies and private enterprises. It makes sense to permit Communist states to take part in GATT under reasonable conditions, if they want to, but it is wrong to think that this will solve many problems. What it will do is to provide a way of dealing with the problems of this trade and, as time passes, may produce a more satisfactory kind of relation, perhaps even a workable body of rules. Decentralization of economic authority in the Communist states makes it a bit more likely that they can be fitted into a reasonable system; it even gives their tariffs more meaning than in the past. Trade can expand without all the problems being solved, but not satisfactorily if they are ignored.

In relation to the Soviet Union, the United States needs more flexibility than it has had in the past so that the President can negotiate effectively. He already has considerable discretion over export controls, but its use depends on political circumstances. He needs

the power called for in a bill not passed by the last Congress to end tariff discrimination against the Communist countries in return for satisfactory commitments on their part. Not commercial advantage but the ability to negotiate should be the main American aim.

Trade with the less developed countries is different again. Our concern with their growth and stability might reasonably lead us to agree to some rather one-sided trade bargains. There is already agreement that the rich countries will not ask full reciprocity from the poor ones, at least so far as the removal of trade barriers is concerned. But this should not be taken to mean that the less developed countries have a blank check and no obligations. If their trade policies amount to nothing more than protection, restriction and the subsidization of exports, they will choke their development instead of fostering it. And even if they follow very enlightened policies, what they can do for themselves in trade depends largely on the developed countries' willingness to open their markets to the competitive products of the poor, low-wage countries.

What blend of measures will contribute most to development and a rational pattern of world trade is a subject going beyond this article. The problems are not simple. For example, a whole choir calls for tariff preferences in favor of the exports of the less developed countries. But any prescriptions ought to be written with a clear recognition that the developed countries have shown less willingness to remove barriers to imports from less developed countries than on trade among themselves. Generous talk about special treatment should always be compared with the reality of the elaborate international arrangements to restrain trade in cotton textiles, one of the few manufactured products that a number of less developed countries are able to export in quantity.

The interconnections between these two segments of trade somewhat blur the distinction implied by saying that the United States needs different policies toward these two kinds of trade. Pointing in the same direction is the fact that a simple division of countries into developed and less developed is too crude to guide policy for very long. Both considerations remind us that the basic elements of American trade policy involve more than the reduction of trade barriers. Other essentials are an agreed body of rules, an organization to look after their application and a way of discussing problems and hearing complaints. This last function becomes increasingly important not only as special categories are recognized, such as "advanced less developed countries," but also as negotiations among the industrialized countries move from the familiar field of tariffs into the unfamiliar ones of non-tariff barriers and other practices that interfere with trade but are not covered by clear-cut rules. One more fundamental of American policy is support for the principle of equal treatment. That statement may ring oddly in a world full of discriminatory trade practices and juxtaposed to acceptance of the case for special treatment of less developed countries. But there is no real inconsistency. To accept departures from the principle of non-discrimination because they permit the removal of trade barriers, as in the case of the Common Market, or to meet special circumstances, as in the case of the less developed countries, is entirely different from abandoning the framework of non-discrimination. In that direction lies the hodgepodge of bilateralism that grew up in the depression, the abandonment of past commitments and the erosion of the accomplishments of the postwar period. Quite different horizons would appear from those described in the first part of this article. Not just American political and economic interest but the rational ordering of world trade depends on constant advocacy of equal treatment.

IV

No trade legislation in the coming year can deal with all these issues. Some are not ready for action, others not yet well enough understood for us to know just what to do. Whatever is done in 1967, whether modest or ambitious, cannot be the solvent for trade-policy problems for the indefinite future, but whatever is done, particularly if it is ambitious, ought to take account of the new prospects that have been opened by the Kennedy Round.

Whether to ask for little or to ask for much is one of the classic problems of the renewal of trade-agreements legislation. A cogent case can be made for the view that with so many new problems arising the best course would be an extension of the existing act for a year or two. That would permit the President to tie up the loose ends the Kennedy Round is bound to leave, while preparing at home and abroad for the kind of approach that will be needed to deal with the problems of the future. The contrary view is also cogent: equip the President to take broad initiatives immediately, in order to build on the momentum of the Kennedy Round and guard against erosion or stagnation here or abroad. This view has its attraction. President Kennedy took the plunge when treading water would have been understandable, and he got the greatest advance in trade legislation since 1934. But he had some advantages that are now absent: the chance to break with a stagnant trade policy; the widespread feeling that the United States had to meet the challenge of the Common Market; and the wish to find a concrete expression of "partnership." No political equivalent of that situation exists now. The idea of an Atlantic free-trade area, which attracts some people, not only lacks charisma but has a negative political charge in the present state of transatlantic relations. It might also create more trade-policy problems than it would solve.

Still, the possibilities warrant something more than temporizing and some positive action would be a better earnest of American intentions than putting the decision off.¹ It should not be too difficult to draw up sensible proposals for broadening the President's power to cut or remove tariffs; to start on the problems of non-tariff barriers; to act on some of the issues of concern to the less developed countries; and to negotiate effectively with the Communist countries. How much can be done depends on a number of circumstances that are not now predictable—not least on what sort of agreement the negotiators bring home from Geneva and especially its agricultural provisions. And if instead of the satisfactory outcome of the Kennedy Round assumed earlier in this article there should be a very disappointing result with only dribs and drabs of unimportant trade concessions, still another situation would exist. Then the case for delay would be strong, to give time to consider whether the failure of the most elaborate effort yet made to reduce trade barriers might not mean that we needed new ideas about how to approach the subject. That kind of outcome would also raise very serious doubts about what the American people are willing—or ought to be willing—to do in trade policy.

There is another possibility, one hopes an unlikely one. That is that the Kennedy Round will become a political sacrifice, killed or made barren by some effort to strike at the United States, the *demandeur* who has been more interested than others in its suc-

cess. If that happened, we would have many decisions to make, and trade policy would quite properly have to be looked at primarily in terms of what use it might be as an instrument of foreign policy. Choices that would be considerably less than second best from the point of view of trade—such as trying to form some kind of trading group omitting the Common Market—would have to be seriously considered. But the prospects of a broad liberalization of world trade are more likely to be set back than advanced by that course.

The less dramatic course suggested earlier does not imply a divorce of American trade policy from foreign policy. Quite the contrary, it assumes that long-run American interests are on the whole well served by persistence in the long and slow process of trade liberalization. There are moments when some foreign-policy aim can hasten the process by galvanizing the country to action it would not otherwise take. There are also risks of setting back the process in the effort to make trade policy respond too closely to relatively short-run political circumstances. Certainly the United States can afford economic sacrifices for foreign-policy ends; it makes them every day. But it is also easy to exaggerate the value of trade policy as a political weapon.

Perhaps trade relations among the industrial countries of the free world—though not East-West or North-South trade—have reached the point at which they should ordinarily be looked at as workaday matters rather than as a form of diplomacy. Certainly the prospects sketched in the earlier part of this article are not those of a preacher's promised land to be attained by those who will be moved to action by a vision. They emerge naturally out of what the advanced industrial countries will have done over the past twenty years and more. That experience has not proved that tariffs and other trade barriers are of no importance or that their removal is the key to prosperity or peace—just that they can be removed without great disturbance and with real benefit.

To look ahead to where we can go after the Kennedy Round is not the same as showing how to get there or laying down a time schedule. The balance of payments of leading countries, and perhaps especially the United States, will offer obstacles; so will difficulties of adjustment and resistance to it. Elections, diplomacy and particular circumstances in one country or another will be at work all the time, more often to slow the process than to speed it. Protectionism is not dead and sometimes takes on new forms. The creation of regional trading arrangements liberalizes segments of trade but at the same time introduces new distortions. And the external tariff of such a group may become not just a trade barrier but also a form of political cement, as we have seen in the Common Market. Broadening the range of trade negotiations to include national policies and practices not ordinarily thought of as trade barriers will itself generate new kinds of resistance and stimulate political fright.

The next stages of trade negotiation will be more complicated than those in the past. Maybe they will be harder. There is nothing inevitable about progress toward freer trade; it depends on what governments are willing to do. Trade barriers do not fall, they are removed. That governments ought to persist in their useful if sometimes pedestrian efforts is clear enough. That conclusion was valid in 1945 when the vision of a postwar liberal trading world was new and hopes of moving rapidly toward it were high. It was valid ten years later when the obstacles to free trade seemed great and the will to pursue it was flagging, and again in 1962 when the United States made its bid to link Europe's internal trade liberalization with the world. What is new in 1967 is not the validity of the case for further liberalization but

the prospect that its result will be a new concept of trade relations between nations.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Oct. 31, 1966]

AFTER KENNEDY ROUND, WHAT?—CURTIS URGES DELIBERATE ACTION

(By Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Congressional delegate to the Kennedy Round)

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 gave the President authority to cut tariffs reciprocally during a five year period ending June 30, 1967. Difficult negotiations making use of this delegated Congressional authority have been formally in process since 1964. If the authority can be utilized, the high rates established by the "Smoot-Hawley" Tariff Act of 1930 which have been reduced periodically by the series of "Reciprocal Trade Acts," will be largely eliminated. Henceforth, the U.S. and other trading nations will increasingly be concerned with non-tariff trade barriers, which have been increasing as tariffs have been decreasing.

To prescribe a specific series of actions to follow the current negotiations is not now possible. We will not know the results of the Trade Expansion Act—"Kennedy Round"—effort for some months, and there is little to be gained in trying to predict them here.

POLICY FOR THE FUTURE

In spite of this uncertainty I do not hesitate to outline some steps toward conceiving a trade policy for the future—the policy that will determine "what" we do after the Kennedy Round—and how to organize to implement that policy. But any new approach must take account of what I consider to be a major trend: a return to an artificial structuring of international trade reflecting mercantilist economic theories.

First, there is the need to maintain momentum and leadership. Since the first Reciprocal Trade Act in 1934, the United States has through periodic renewals of that act and six rounds of tariff negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, led a forward movement toward greater world trade. It has been suggested that the Kennedy Round be followed by a "breathing space" in which no action is taken. But without such momentum U.S. trade policy could settle into a series of fragmented, ad hoc responses unrelated to economic principle. Such forward momentum can only result from an effort to achieve well conceived foreign economic policy goals. We must establish new goals toward which to move, and a strategy for achieving them.

NATURE OF GOALS

What are these goals? We should strive toward a world where agreements about fair trade and economic practices would permit a minimum of barriers to the free exchange of money, goods and men, a world economy that allows the fullest adjustment with the least friction of national economies based on hard work and innovation; a world where human and physical resources are developed and utilized to allow the maximum of human fulfillment and to produce the maximum of goods and services in increased quality and variety.

In this setting, our foreign trade policy should be directed toward eliminating the really troublesome barriers to trade, trade that is based on fair competitive forces. This is not a simple matter of removing tariffs and quotas. Foreign trade flows in practice do not respond simply in accord with the theory of comparative advantage. Trade is in fact affected by a staggering variety of devices (many in essence governmental subsidies) which result from differences in national taxation systems, concepts of economic competition and government regulation of enterprise, variable ocean shipping and internal transportation systems. Often these are devious other-than-tariff methods

¹ The Council on Foreign Relations will shortly publish a succinct analysis of future needs and specific proposals for the extension of the President's powers by John Evans, an experienced negotiator who for years headed the American delegation to GATT. I have gained much from talking with Mr. Evans and from reading his manuscript.

of reflecting subsidies to a domestic industry or interest group—or as the interest group might say, and sometimes with accuracy, methods of retaliation against subsidies granted by foreign governments to their industries.

CODE OF BUSINESS PRACTICE

For some time I have suggested that we begin to resolve these difficult, tangled problems through negotiating an international code of business practice which would include such matters as antitrust, patent and copyright laws, anti sweat-shop labor laws, etc. To some extent the GATT itself is the embryo of such an agreement. At the same time, a program is badly needed to mesh trade with foreign private investment and with aid, to create a truly adequate policy toward developing countries that properly emphasizes the role of trade.

To devise a trade policy broad enough in scope to deal with these problems requires that we formulate what I call a "total" trade policy addressing itself to the "forgotten" trade problems. We must choose an effective strategy and mold a suitable governmental organization to carry out that policy.

ATLANTIC FREE TRADE IDEAS

As the Kennedy Round has met continuing obstacles and frustration has increased, many ideas about such future strategies have been expressed. There is a disillusionment with reciprocal tariff negotiations in a multilateral forum. Some have gone so far as to state that the unconditional most-favored-nation principle and multilateral trading have lost their usefulness. From this disillusionment with the post Smoot-Hawley approach to trade expansion two main groups spring, each with a different emphasis.

The first group wishes to move toward "Atlantic Union," which in their eyes was an important part of the initial Kennedy Round concept. They would do so by forming, perhaps by treaty, a "free trade area" of like-thinking countries that would agree progressively to reduce all barriers to trade among them. But I am not certain that this group equates removing "barriers to trade" with establishing a code of fair trade and economic practice which would remove the initial causes for the barriers being created. Any country, such as the European Economic Community, that might wish to join such a treaty in order to take part in its advantages, could do so on the condition that it accept the rules of the club. This group must be careful not to react in a spiteful and ill-considered way to what it considers the "rebuffs" of the Six, particularly France.

CONCERN FOR LDC'S

The concern of the second group is focused on the less developed countries (LDC's); on devising special trade measures on their behalf. Comparatively little attention has been given such measures in the United States. We all too often seem to satisfy ourselves with what can be called conscience payments to LDC's in the form of money transfers—aid not trade. Impetus to consider special trade measures for LDC's has come from abroad—from the developing countries themselves and their organizations, or from European countries. But these countries often seem more intent on maintaining some remnants of their colonial trade relationships for their own benefit than really permitting their former colonies to develop viable economic bases.

These nations now advocate steps that include additional commodity stabilization plans, land preferences. The need for price stability, both by the seller and the buyer, is a goal worth achieving, but the present approach to price stabilization through commodity control is of very doubtful value. International futures markets, properly regulated by government to ensure fairness and honesty, are a much more efficient way of evening out price swings, yet this approach has received very little consideration.

Schemes whereby LDC manufactured and semi-manufactured products are given preferential access to developed country markets have been emphasized by LDC's. Proposals for such preferences have advanced to a stage where much wider public understanding of them has, as a matter of the national interest, become very urgent.

UNCONDITIONAL MFN ROLE

Both lines of strategy would require a major deviation from the unconditional most-favored-nation principle, which has been a keystone of U.S. commercial policy. It is said that, after all, the unconditional MFN policy is not "holy," and indeed it is not. But in fact it has been very useful. If we decide to suspend it, we should be fully aware of what it is we are taking leave of, and what it is we will be undertaking. Suspension could lead to complete abandonment. The alternative to unconditional MFN and therefore the principle of non-discrimination among trading nations could be a chaotic international marketplace, which would surely be reflected in political divisiveness.

Neither strategy is exclusive. They could be combined and-or integrated with more traditional trade strategies. There has simply not been enough discussion and debate in order to evaluate them, and it is not yet possible to decide their merits.

How do we go about formulating the appropriate new trade policy—new goals and the strategy to implement them? There are several essential prerequisites. The first is that scholars and practicing businessmen study the problems in wider context and with a much longer perspective of the development of present concepts of international trade. Then both Congress and the Executive can give and maintain some needed leadership in shaping new legislation and implementing it.

THE PUBLIC POLICY PROCESS

The legislative process does not involve simply the passage of a bill by Congress. A bill signed into law is the culmination of a process of study and debate, involving the legislative and the executive branches, and including all concerned elements of the public—labor, agriculture, mining, chemistry, manufacturing, commercial and academic.

As with any major bill, new trade legislation will require reaching a consensus based upon public confrontation of the various theories and subject to cross examination and rebuttal testimony, in which Congressional institutions must play the major role. A first step is well-prepared public hearings by the competent Congressional committees which have authority in foreign economic policy—chiefly the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees, and the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee. Here a most essential requirement is missing—the President's Annual Report on Trade does not receive the attention it needs through annual hearings by the right committee. It should have the same national attention that the President's Annual Economic Report receives.

PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

The creation of such firm underpinnings would minimize attempts to structure trade legislation in an unsound way. Public affairs organizations have a large responsibility here.

New legislation, when the time for it arrives, could take several forms. It might simply be a series of amendments to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The only sections that will expire are those that give authority to reduce U.S. tariffs. The remainder of the act could stand, and much of it could remain unchanged. But it will perhaps be necessary to shape entirely new legislation to implement the goals that we set.

I have said that a major task will be to

create a suitable administrative structure to ensure that new policy goals and legislative intent will be implemented and elaborated. This structure should be provided in any new trade legislation.

NEED FOR CENTRALIZATION

The conduct of U.S. trade policy is highly fragmented and the need for centralization great. Many agencies are deeply concerned with foreign trade. The State Department retains primary jurisdiction in the area of commodity agreements, trade preferences and trading blocs, as well as concern with a wide variety of other problems, including economic development financing and technical assistance. The Treasury Department has primary responsibility for administering tax treaties, U.S. anti-dumping and customs laws. The Commerce Department administers U.S. export controls and the export promotion program. The Justice Department, Federal Trade Commission and Tariff Commission share authority in the area of international antitrust and unfair trade practices, as does the State Department with its concern in the area of foreign restrictive business practices. The Interior Department administers the large U.S. oil import quota program and is interested in trade in metals. The Agriculture Department is very active in dealing with international agriculture disposals and other problems. The Labor Department is active in the International Labor Organization (ILO) and related problems. The result is a proliferation of jurisdictions and activities—often without being related to a central core of principle and policy.

The Special Representative for Trade Negotiations was authorized to be appointed by the 1962 Trade Expansion Act, but that act did not fully establish an Office for Trade Negotiations. However, I believe the Congress clearly intended that powers be delegated to the Special Representative beyond the conduct of the reciprocal trade negotiations under the act. The act failed to make certain that the Special Representative's Office would have a professional career staff. Its dependence on the State Department for the administration and funding of its Geneva delegation and other activities is a weakness.

New trade legislation should establish an administrative structure strong enough to coordinate U.S. foreign economic policy and to make sure that sound economic judgments are made before steps are taken on foreign policy grounds.

NEO-MERCANTILISM?

There is a present danger that the U.S. will fall into a course of action simply through indirection. I note a trend toward increased, rather than lessened, government direct participation rather than simply government regulation to structure international commerce: a movement which might well be termed neo-mercantilism, as opposed to the laissez-faire reform promoted by Adam Smith and others to remove government from direct participation, and to relegate it to regulating a free and competitive marketplace. The proliferation of preferential trading areas (customs unions and free trade areas) and more recently of special arrangement 1) between a dominant industrial power and several poorer nations, 2) among a handful of countries covering one or several products, and 3) among many nations to arrange all trade in a single commodity, are strongly reminiscent of the mercantilist approach. The pious expressions about successful U.S. leadership toward a nondiscriminatory, open trading world through lowering tariffs, with which certain groups flattered themselves in the early 1960's, sound hollow in 1966.

These are reasons for an intensive national and international reexamination of trade policy that recognizes that we cannot put the new wine of increasing international

trade in the old bottles of high tariffs and neo-mercantilism. We are presented with a choice between a world economy arranged on mercantilist lines, and a world economy dedicated to maximizing the benefits of economic freedom. Yet we must be careful at the same time not to adopt casually some cute new formula, hastily conceived and ill-considered. Congress, the Executive, and the people all have a role in deciding "what" happens "after the Kennedy Round." It is for us all to decide.

LEGISLATION TO REMOVE IMPEDIMENTS TO LABOR MOBILITY

Mr. ERLÉNBOEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the continuing challenges we face is to meet the demand for increased skills in our labor force. It is a matter of highest priority that we do everything possible to develop our most important resource—manpower. Programs such as the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and, hopefully, enactment of the Human Investment Act are significant steps in a sound manpower training policy.

Corresponding with the need to upgrade skills is another need which must not be neglected—that of matching the skills with the job vacancies available. Retraining the unemployed and filling the many thousands of jobs which are now going begging in our society is not a one step job. In addition to training and retraining programs, attention must be given to encouraging workers to seek out jobs commensurate with their increased skills. One effective way to encourage this is to remove the many impediments to labor mobility contained in the Internal Revenue Code.

Thus, I am today introducing three bills designed to promote labor mobility by conforming our tax laws to an enlightened labor policy.

A BILL TO EXCLUDE FROM INCOME CERTAIN REIMBURSED MOVING EXPENSES

The first of these bills provides that certain moving expenses paid by an employer shall not be included as taxable income of the employee taxpayer as under present law. American industry has long followed the practice of transferring employees to new locations for a variety of reasons such as training, staffing new facilities, and retaining valuable skills of employees where an industry activity is closed down. When these transfers occur the employer has generally reimbursed the employee for the expense caused by the employer in moving the employee, members of his family, and his personal possessions to the new location.

The Internal Revenue Service has ruled that the expense of transporting the employee, his family, and household effects to the new work location is actually the employer's expense and thus is excludable from the employee's income. This clearly is a correct interpretation. However, the Internal Revenue Service

contends that all other expense created by the move and for which the employee is reimbursed by his employer is income to the employee and subject to income tax. This seems to be an unduly strained interpretation.

When either Government or industry requires an employee to transfer his work location and move his family to a new place of residence, it is only simple equity that the employer pay the expense of the move and that the employee not be forced to dip into his own pocket. Thus when the employee bears the expense because of the move which he required, it seems in error to levy a tax on reimbursed expenses on the strained interpretation that the employee has received income. Indeed, such a tax defeats the purpose of reimbursement which is to keep the employee financially whole.

The expenses involved are substantially those which the Federal Government would pay for its employees under Public Law 89-516 passed in the last Congress. To be specific, my bill would exclude from the employee's income reimbursement for the following:

The reasonable cost of moving household goods and personal effects and of traveling from the old to the new residence. These expenses are presently excludable from income under existing IRS rulings as I previously stated.

The reasonable cost of traveling by the employee and his spouse for the purpose of searching for a new residence. The civil service bill provides for reimbursement of this same expense.

The reasonable cost of meals and lodging of the taxpayer and members of his family while occupying temporary quarters, but not to exceed 30 days in the United States or 60 days in territories or foreign countries. The civil service bill provides for payment of this same expense under regulations to be prescribed.

The expenses incident to the sale or exchange of a residence or the settlement of an unexpired lease and the expenses incident to the purchase of a new residence. The civil service bill provides for reimbursement of these expenses. Neither bill would permit compensation for any loss suffered by the employee in the sale of a residence.

Miscellaneous expenses to the extent they are directly attributable to the move and are substantiated by the taxpayer. However, these expenses are limited to not more than 2 weeks' wages or \$1,000 whichever is less and, in the case of a single employee without dependents, only one-half of this amount. The civil service bill provides for reimbursement of similar amounts under regulations to be prescribed.

A BILL TO PERMIT A TAXPAYER TO DEDUCT AS A TRADE OR BUSINESS EXPENSE THE COST OF TRAVEL, MEALS, AND LODGING WHILE EMPLOYED AWAY FROM HOME

The second bill which I am introducing today, also designed to make our workers more geographically mobile and thus more able to take advantage of new opportunities, provides for a redefinition of the concept of "home" in our tax laws. The discouragement to worker mobility in our tax law revolves around the outdated concept of home. In earlier days, in days of less dramatic technological

change, a worker's home was, as the tax law defines it, the principal place of his employment. Today, however, this is not the case. Technological progress, as I have noted, calls for mobility and, since most workers today own their homes, to call home the place of a worker's employment ignores the fact that he may for some extended period maintain his family at his place of residence and be employed elsewhere.

Two specific cases illustrate the operation of our tax laws to discourage worker mobility. The first deals with defense industry workers, in this instance machinists working for McDonnell Aircraft Corp., who must spend extended periods away from their homes in the process of developing modern weapons. The highly complex military hardware of today often demands long periods of testing, testing which, in the case of McDonnell products, takes place far away from the company's home office and the homes and families of the workers who must participate in these tests. Some provision is made for this type of situation in the tax laws; if there is a temporary period of employment away from home, per diem paid during this time may be considered spent for business purposes. But the rule as to a temporary period is very narrow and if this period is indefinite, the worker's home in the tax sense follows his job.

The second situation is exemplified by the problem facing the Chrysler Corp.'s employees who transferred from a plant in Indiana to the company's new plant in St. Louis County, Mo. Their tax home went with the plant to St. Louis, but many of the workers left their families in Indiana for some period, waiting to sell their homes there and find suitable places to live in Missouri.

In both of these cases the tax laws discourage the worker from being mobile, from taking the job which will involve a period of work away from home or from taking a job away from one's present home. This is the direct opposite of what we need. We need to encourage mobility of our workers as well as we need to encourage the upgrading of their skills. Both of these will continue materially to the achievement of our economic goals. Allowing business expense deductions for education and training and revising the tax rules as to the definition of home, making it, for a homeowner worker, the place where he owns his home and maintains his family would be significant steps toward the overall goal of helping America meet its potential.

A BILL TO ASSIST TRANSPORTATION AND MOBILITY OF DISABLED WORKERS

Mr. Speaker, the third bill which I am introducing today would allow a disabled worker to deduct from his taxable income the costs of his transportation to and from work. The disabled worker has special problems in the area of transportation and normally such additional expenses which he may be forced to incur are not deductible from his income tax. This is an unnecessary and discouraging obstacle to any efforts to rehabilitate disabled persons and bring them back into the work force. I think that it is one of the most meaningful of human activities, the rehabilitation of the individual to permit him, as nearly

as possible to lead a normal life, and this bill would be one small step in reaching this goal.

Incorporating a suggestion provided me by the Department of Labor in 1964, the bill is now written in general language rather than listing the particular disabilities which would compel an individual to incur additional transportation costs. The intent of the bill is clearly to provide assistance to any person whose physical impairment makes it difficult to use public transportation to get to work.

YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM STOPS MAJOR TRADE DEAL WITH SOVIET UNION

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have been proud to serve during the last 5 years on the national advisory board of the Nation's largest conservative youth group, Young Americans for Freedom. I share this honor with many of my colleagues in the Congress and other leading American citizens. I have been pleased to see Young Americans for Freedom grow from a small group of college students in 1960 to a present membership of more than 30,000 high school and college students in over 450 chapters in every State.

I am especially pleased to inform the House that Young Americans for Freedom, singlehandedly, has succeeded in stopping a proposed major trade agreement between the American Motors Corp. and the Soviet Union. The proposed trade deal was announced last November by American Motors and as a result it seemed all but certain that the Communists would receive thousands of automobiles made in the United States. Such trade would allow the Communists to bolster their own economy and shift large quantities of strategic resources from the Russian consumer market into the production of more military aid for the Communist war effort against American fighting men in Vietnam. I include in my remarks at this point a news article from the Chicago Tribune of November 27, 1966, in which the AMC-Communist trade deal was announced:

AMERICAN MOTORS HOPES TO SELL CARS TO REDS

DETROIT, November 26.—American Motors Corporation officials today said they plan a drive aimed at selling automobiles behind the iron curtain.

If successful, A.M.C. would be the first United States auto firm to sell cars directly in the Soviet Union or other communist nations in eastern Europe.

"I'm going to Russia and I am going to sell some cars there," said William S. Pickett, A.M.C.'s vice president for international automotive operations.

ACTION IN 1967

Pickett expressed hope the project would be under way next year "if we can work out some kind of selling arrangement."

A.M.C.'s sales in the United States have been sliding, but its overseas picture is bright, with its 1966 export setting a high of 45,991 vehicles.

"I know we couldn't go to the Russians and say 'here is our car, give us \$1,800,'" Pickett said. "We may have to work out a barter arrangement."

He said A.M.C. could build the cars in Argentina, sell them to iron curtain countries, which, in turn, would pay for the automobiles by shipping steel to American Motors.

ARRANGEMENT NOT NEW

"We've done this before," he said. "We shipped cars to Colombia from our Belgian plant and took payment in coffee."

Pickett said a third firm bought the coffee from A.M.C.

"These are the kinds of deals we are looking for," he said. "I think the communist bloc will more than pay its way."

Details of a sales agreement have not been planned yet, he said.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union and American Motors Corp. did not reckon with the energy of thousands of patriotic young Americans willing to exercise their constitutional right of free speech. After the trade deal was made public, Young Americans for Freedom launched a nationwide campaign of protest against trading with the enemy, especially in time of war. The Young Americans for Freedom national protest began on January 9 and on January 20 American Motors sent a telegram to national YAF in which they now make clear they will not trade with the Communists. At this point I wish to include a statement made to the press by Young Americans for Freedom, on January 24:

AMERICAN MOTORS DROPS TRADE DEAL WITH COMMUNISTS; YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM CLAIMS VICTORY IN PROTEST CAMPAIGN

Young Americans for Freedom, the largest conservative youth group in the nation, today announced that they have been notified by the American Motors Corporation of Detroit that the auto making firm will not make any trade deals with "Communist bloc nations." The National Chairman of YAF, Tom Huston, called this a "victory for the millions of loyal Americans who oppose trade with the Communist enemy." Huston commended American Motors for their revised stand on the Red trade issue.

William S. Pickett, Vice President of American Motors had announced on November 26, 1966, that he was going to Russia to negotiate a trade deal. The Associated Press quoted him as saying: "I am going to Russia and I am going to sell some cars there." Pickett also said AMC was trying to work out almost any kind of agreement with the Russians, including bartering steel for finished cars. He told the AP, "These are the kinds of deals we are looking for. I think the Communist bloc will more than pay its way."

The American Motors announcement of Red trade brought strong protests from the 30,000 member Young Americans for Freedom, who contended that shipping autos to the Russians would directly aid in their assistance of the Communist war effort in North Viet Nam. In 1965 a similar YAF protest caused the Firestone Rubber Co. to cancel the building of a rubber manufacturing factory in Communist Rumania.

On January 9, 1967, Young Americans for Freedom launched a nationwide campaign of picketing local AMC dealerships. Many AMC dealers sided with the young conservatives and protested their own company's foreign trade policy. General public reaction was strongly in favor of YAF's position, especially in view of the Viet Nam war.

The drumfire of local protest from YAF members in many states led to the announcement by American Motors. Privately AMC officials admitted that they had been pressured by the U.S. State and Commerce Departments to conclude a deal with the Soviet Union.

The American Motors announcement was signed by William S. Pickett, and stated in part: "American Motors has no plans, programs or intentions to trade with Communist bloc nations. . . . Our intentions are to continue our growing trade with our traditional customers all of whom would certainly be numbered as traditional allies and not members of the Communist bloc. . . . The story of November 26th was a misinterpretation."

The National Chairman of YAF, Tom Huston, congratulated AMC for reversing its previously announced intentions and called the change "a victory for the millions of loyal Americans who oppose trade with the Communists." Young Americans for Freedom is proud to have played a part in discouraging a trade deal with those who are supplying most of the military equipment needed to continue the war effort of the Communist North Vietnamese. Huston announced that YAF would continue its national efforts focusing its actions on the defeat of President Johnson's proposed liberalization of the laws governing trade with Communist nations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks by commending Young Americans for Freedom for this patriotic action on their part which stands in stark contrast to the small minority of beatniks and draft dodgers who compose the rag tag revolution of the so-called New Left. I include at this point a full account of the American Motors matter which appears in the January issue of the New Guard, the official magazine of Young Americans for Freedom:

YAF EXPOSES, HALTS AMERICAN MOTORS PLANS TO TRADE WITH THE ENEMY

Exposure by Young Americans for Freedom apparently has caused the giant American Motors Corporation, manufacturers of the Rambler, to cancel their plans to sell cars in the U.S.S.R.

The November 27 issue of the *Chicago Tribune* carried an Associated Press dispatch which quoted William S. Pickett, AMC's vice president for international automotive operations, as saying that "I'm going to Russia and I am going to sell some cars there."

According to AP, Pickett expressed hope the project would be under way in 1967 "if we can work out some kind of selling arrangement."

A month later, American Motors issued a statement saying it has no plans to sell cars to the Soviet Union and "never has had any."

"Like all companies with a large international business," it asserted, "we have discussed the pros and cons of trade in every part of the world but our plans are exclusively concentrated on our business in friendly countries."

What happened in between the two statements was the appearance of a YAF picket line in front of the American Motors dealer in Valparaiso, Ind., and unsuccessful attempts by the main office of American Motors to intimidate the YAF students by calling the city chief of police and college authorities.

Ronald Pearson, chairman of the YAF chapter at Valparaiso University, had called American Motors' main office in Detroit to get a confirmation or denial of their plans to sell cars to Russia. He was unable to get either. The rest of the story is reported by John Hill in *The Torch*, Valparaiso University's student newspaper:

"The local YAF chapter called the main

office of American Motors to inform them that plans would proceed with picketing. The officials promised to have a denial of Pickett's statement sent over the UPI wires within an hour with the stipulation that if such a wire appeared YAF would call off the picket.

"For two hours, YAF members stopped making picket signs and watched the UPI releases in the office of WVUR-FM, VU's campus radio station. Pearson finally called Chicago UPI to put a tracer on the story; the Chicago office said that the story would appear on wire by midnight.

"The statement, given to the Detroit UPI stated: 'Mr. Roy Abernathy, president of American Motors, tonight said the company has no plans to seek auto sales in the Soviet union. . . .'

"After an hour, Pearson again called the Chicago office, which said that the story would not appear because the statement by Abernathy was made only to 'placate an individual in Indiana.'

"UPI would not carry the statement because it would probably have to be retracted. It stood by the original story carried by its wire, that AMC was entering into negotiations with the Soviet Union.

"Pearson then contacted other Indiana chapter chairmen and under the circumstances decided to proceed with the demonstration.

"Further complications arose when the local YAF chapter applied for a parade permit. An AMC official from Chicago called future Valparaiso Chief of Police Al Miller exerting pressure not to issue the parade permit. Saturday morning, just a few hours before the scheduled protest, the AMC Chicago office also called VU officials to ask them to forbid University students from picketing."

The Valparaiso YAF students did picket, however, and when national YAF promised to extend the campaign across the country American Motors backed down.

One aspect of the YAF campaign was a telegram from Tom Huston, YAF's national chairman, to Michigan Governor George Romney. "I respectfully request," he wrote "that you use your influence to stop the proposed auto sales trade deal. . . . As a former head of American Motors you are in a unique position to help the United States war effort in Vietnam by opposing this trade deal which would indirectly give aid to the Communists in North Vietnam. We urge you to prevail on your former business associates to drop any negotiations with the Russians. We hope that you will agree with the millions of Americans who believe that no amount of business profit can justify trading with the enemy in time of war."

No reply has been received from Governor Romney.

In a letter to chapter chairmen YAF executive director David R. Jones wrote that "Communist countries have repeatedly and publicly pledged their support to the Communist Viet Cong and are backing these pledges by supplying everything from MIG fighter planes to weapons and foodstuffs.

"National YAF," he continued, "believes that the selling of autos to Russia will most definitely aid the Soviets' support of the war in Vietnam. This will result because it allows the Reds to divert metals, rubber and other materials away from their domestic market and into their military industrial efforts."

It was YAF which in 1965 almost single-handedly stopped the Firestone Tire and Rubber Company from building a rubber manufacturing plant in Communist Rumania. In spite of U.S. State Department support Firestone withdrew when customer pressure resulted from YAF picket lines at local stores. Sen. William Fulbright liberal chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee blasted Young Americans for Freedom

in speeches on the Senate floor only to be rebutted by Senators agreeing with YAF. Eventually the State Department came out with a slick 20-page booklet entitled "Private Boycotts vs The National Interest."

Predictably, the liberals are angry again. An editorial in the Washington *Evening Star* regrets "the retreat by American Motors Corp."

"What all this really amounts to," says the *Star*, "is that a group of self-proclaimed vigilantes are (sic) contravening the foreign policy of the United States."

It is not clear from the editorial whether the *Star* wishes to repeal the right of assembly enunciated in the Bill of Rights.

WORLD'S FIRST FLOATING AUXILIARY NUCLEAR POWERPLANT

Mr. ERLNBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the attainment of a significant milestone by the Department of Defense. I have just been advised that the world's first floating auxiliary nuclear powerplant has achieved a self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction at Fort Belvoir, Va.

This 10,000-kilowatt electrical plant was constructed by the Martin Co. under contract with the Department of Defense. Named the Sturgis after the late Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Jr., former Army Chief of Engineers and early advocate of the development of nuclear powerplants for military use, this modern powerplant will be capable of operating for 1 year without refueling. A diesel powerplant operating for a similar period of time would require over 160,000 barrels of fuel.

The reactor core of the Sturgis is a little larger than an oil drum and is made up of 32 individual fuel elements low, enriched uranium dioxide pellets. The plant, which is mounted in the hull of a modified World War II Liberty ship drawn from the reserve fleet, can be towed to any port in the world to support military operations or provide electrical power in the wake of natural disasters.

It is important to note that the procurement of the Sturgis by the Department of Defense represents a significant utilization of technological development by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. As senior minority member of the Armed Services Committee and a ranking member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I will follow the utilization of this advanced electrical power source with especially great interest.

THE HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY

Mr. ERLNBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the shortest biographical sketch in the Congressional Directory for the past year read:

John Edward Fogarty, Democrat, of Harmony, R.I., elected in 1940; reelected to succeeding Congresses.

While the brevity of that record bespoke his modesty, it stands in sharp contrast to the long list of accomplishments that bore his mark during his distinguished career.

There were some who believed that the bill he presented before the House each year contained funds in excess of those which could be prudently spent. It might well be that a careful examination of expenditures would give credence to such a claim. Perhaps, confidentially, John Fogarty would not dispute this point for his eyes were more on results and hopes than on financial management. He seemed anxious, even overanxious to realize the fruition of his dreams and efforts. He seemed to be fighting against time and time was to be short and there was so much to do. He tried with dogged determination and, in his field he traveled far, and there are those who are with us today as living testimony to the product of his ambitions.

No period of civilization has seen more tangible results in the sciences than has been accomplished in the past two decades. Swept along with these advances has been the great progress in the knowledge and treatment of the diseases of the human mind and body. When scientists yearned to work but had neither funds nor facilities, John Fogarty and his subcommittee filled their needs. When scientists moved with less speed than his impatient desire for results demanded, he prodded them. When they seemed to him dilatory, he reprimanded them.

It is not for me to judge the place of one in the annals of history. I cannot accord to John Fogarty a lineal position in the long list of those who have contributed to fields of medicine and surgery. By profession he became a legislator. He never mastered or even understood the techniques of the scalpel nor the microscope, but who is to say that his name and fame have less lustre than those already widely acknowledged in these technical fields?

His fine family has every right to be proud of his distinguished record, and the world is a better place in which to live because John Fogarty served his fellow man well.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. ERLNBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, January 22, marked the 49th anni-

versary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic and I am proud to join with many of my colleagues and thousands of Americans in commemorating the historic date. I have done this before on the floor of this House on January 24, 1963, and January 22, 1964.

It was on January 22, 1918, that the Ukrainian Central Rada issued a solemn Act of Restoration of the Ukraine as a sovereign nation, called the Ukrainian National Republic.

But, although the new republic was recognized by many governments, including Soviet Russia, it was soon under attack by Russia and after nearly 4 years of valiant battle, succumbed to the might of the Communist forces.

Brutally crushed as a Republic and absorbed into the Soviet Union, Ukrainians have since suffered loss of freedom under despotic Communist rule.

Sunday Ukrainians throughout the world paused to observe their greatest holiday. It was ironic and unfortunate that those still in the Ukraine were unable to celebrate, except in fear and in great secrecy. This should be a grim reminder for those who urge us to abandon South Vietnam.

As we honor them on their Independence Day, we join hopes for new freedom and reaffirm our dedication to an increased effort to accomplish self-determination for the Ukrainian nation, and indeed all captive nations.

BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE STRIKING OF MEDALS COMMEMORATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, with my two distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from California, Congressmen JAMES B. UTT and LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the striking of medals commemorating the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego, Calif. The cost of minting these medals would be financed by the San Diego 200th Anniversary, Inc., a nonprofit organization, at no expense to the Government. Under my proposal, the U.S. Mint would be authorized to furnish the nonprofit group with up to 500,000 commemorative medals.

San Diegans, and all Californians as well, look forward to the 200th anniversary of our city's founding in 1769. The reason for this statewide interest is that San Diego is the cradle of California's glorious history. We proudly recall how Gaspar de Portola, the Spanish Governor of Lower California, and Father Junipero Serra began the colonization of California with the establish-

ment of Mission San Diego de Alcalá. From that first mission was built a chain of 21 missions, each a day's journey apart, along the Camino Real—King's Highway. In the process, the mission padres imparted to the Indians knowledge of God, the construction trades, irrigation, and agriculture, while Spanish soldiers set up military establishments known as presidios. These missions, which laid the foundation stones for the subsequent rush of settlers into the Golden State, were established at a time when 2,000 miles away Daniel Boone was still trekking through the wilderness of Tennessee and Kentucky.

Recognizing our debt to these brave Spaniards, we San Diegans in 1969 plan a yearlong celebration of our glorious heritage. Many citizens have been working for more than a year laying the groundwork for our bicentennial. To emphasize California's rich inheritance of Spanish culture and tradition, the anniversary committee has contacted the Government of Spain to explore the possibility of constructing a Spanish building in San Diego to house documents and artifacts of the period of exploration and conquest. In conjunction with this, city and county schools are conducting an essay contest entitled "San Diego's Spanish Heritage" with a trip for two to Spain as reward for the winner. Historical societies will continue their research and writing on diverse phases of our history, while many community performing arts groups are planning original productions on California history. Recalling the important role of the friars in San Diego's founding, large interfaith observances are planned and preparations are underway to invite His Holiness Pope Paul to come to San Diego to participate in the 200th year of Christianity in California.

These are only a few of the many projects, but I will not take more of my colleagues' time for a recitation of our many ambitious celebration plans for 1969. I do request, however, their rapid and favorable consideration of the bill which I have introduced today. These commemorative medals will be an important and integral part of our bicentennial year. They will provide a lasting memento to San Diego's vital role in American history.

ELECTION OF GOVERNOR OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. ERLNBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ERLNBORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, during the first days of the 90th Congress legislation was introduced in the Senate which would provide for the popular election of the Governor of the Territory of the Virgin Islands.

At the end of the last session an effort was made to approve the governorship bill for the territory, but in view of the

lateness of the session and the immature actions of the Governor and legislature in setting up reapportionment of the islands earlier, I felt that the proposal should be held over until the present Congress in order that the legislation could be more thoroughly studied by the respective committees of the Congress.

Although I did not follow the recent elections in the islands in depth, I have heard various reports on the type and method of electioneering which was held last fall in St. Thomas, St. Croix, and the Island of St. John.

I wish to commend to my colleagues a report on these activities by the news media, "Caribbean Report," as well as the letter which I received from the associate editor of this report, which is incorporated as a part of my remarks.

I strongly suggest that before any action is taken on legislation to provide for an elective Governor of the Virgin Islands that the Congress take a closer look at the existing electoral and legislative practices of the islands.

I also draw to the attention of my colleagues the remarks of the senior Senator from Vermont which appeared in the daily RECORD of January 17 on pages A125, A126, and A127.

The report follows:

CARIBBEAN REPORT,

New York, N.Y., January 17, 1967.

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: Like most journalists, we are always delighted to uncover scandal, but we were really shocked by the reports of the elections in the U.S. Virgin Islands. With decisions in the offing on the Elected Governors Bill, and in light of the general financial relationship of the islands to the mainland, it seems to us that a closer look should be taken at the existing electoral and legislative practices.

We hope that the enclosed issue of *Caribbean Report* will help to spur such a study and will be of interest to you.

Sincerely,

PHYLLIS FREEMAN,
Associate Editor.

[From Caribbean Report, December 1966]

OUT-TAMMANYING TAMMANY HALL

The 1966 elections in the USVI seem to have hit an all-time high for charges of fraud, free beer at the polls, voting by dead-men, minors, and psychiatric inmates. Herewith, a special report from our VI correspondent:

The political spoils system in the VI would make old Boss Tweed green with envy. Governor Palewonsky's statements that the VI now has a two-party system are only for Washington's consumption. Except for two candidates, the Victory '66 coalition that opposed Pale and his Mortar and Pestle (or Unity) Democrats were all registered Democrats of established standing. And the two Republicans went down to defeat.

Pale's electoral strength came from a tremendous roster of unsophisticated government employees. On a per capita basis, the VI has the highest number of employees on government payroll of any of the states or territories. These totally unqualified persons spend most of their time running their own businesses or shops, while regularly collecting paychecks solely for their "services" for the Mortar and Pestle Party.

Among the "services" they rendered in last month's balloting were these: In St. Thomas the Election Board counted 957 more votes

cast than the number reported by the Election Supervisor. A decisive number of ballots in close races were discarded as "spoiled." Coalition party challengers charge election officials themselves disfigured ballots with holes or pencil smudges when the opposition tally ran uncomfortably high. Four coalition nominees, Bertha Boschulte, Ron de Lugo, Omar Brown, and Len Stein, promptly petitioned for recounts, but to no one's surprise, the new canvass confirmed the original victors. A two-page ad in the November 15 *VI Daily News* notes that, after failing to con the District Court of Appeals into upholding the "loyalty oath," Pale's Mortar and Pestle boys proceeded to fancy up the ballots. The coalition of 13 Democrats and 2 Republicans were jointly listed on the ballot as "Republicans." The Regular M & P Dems had their insignia placed at the bottom of the ballot with photos of both JFK and Johnson, and the words: "Let us continue." By marking this party symbol (or the unadorned eagle for the "Republicans"), a person could vote a straight ticket. Since there was no clue that this was the significance of the symbols, it is not improbable that many voters thought that they were indicating a party preference, as in a primary, rather than nullifying votes cast for split tickets on the ballot's upper portion. Yet, the day after the elections, Pale boasted that "the choice between candidates and parties was clearly understood." Shades of Duvalier and his similar maneuver in the last Haitian election.

Conclusion: Despite the statements by the Governor and his M & P associates that "now we are mature enough to elect our own governor," there is room for doubt. In this election, they demonstrated the maturity of teen-age hoodlums while splitting the loot of their first heist. The basic cause of the lack of efficiency and integrity in the VI government is that the governorship is a political plum.

Now firmly ensconced in office, VI lawmakers have voted themselves pay raises of \$3,000, an increase of 50 per cent—making the total take for this part-time job \$9,000 per year, plus the regular \$1,800 for expenses.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

Mr. ERLÉNBOURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the problems of increased air pollution, the growth of substandard housing in urban areas, and the mounting rate of traffic jams on our highways and in our cities, are typical of the major national problems requiring prompt and effective corrective action. To accomplish such action, outdated methods of management will not suffice. I believe that, just as the modern methods of management, such as system analysis, have been successfully applied in the defense and space efforts, they could be usefully applied in other public programs.

I am pleased to join my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], in proposing the establishment of a National Commission on Public Management, to seek the best techniques for managing the public's business. Since this bill was first introduced in the last session of the 89th Congress, it has

received increased public support, and recently it received the endorsement of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

The Commission, to be appointed by the President, will be composed of Members of Congress, representatives from government, business, labor, and education. After reviewing the various management techniques and the public problems requiring solution, the Commission will then, in a final report, set forth a specific plan for attaining our national goals economically and expeditiously.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come to modernize our management methods. The establishment of a National Commission on Public Management is the necessary first step.

ABANDONING PATRONAGE IN POSTAL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. ERLÉNBOURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the problems of our post office system—the extraordinary number of complaints, misdeliveries, nondeliveries, delays, and backups, all of which have led to a marked increase in complaints to most public officials. It is no longer a matter of simple inconvenience, Mr. Speaker. There is not a segment of the economy which does not in some measure rely on the mails, and it is an unfortunate situation when the material and mental resources of the present administration cannot meet the administrative and mechanical problems of moving the mail from the city to the suburbs or vice versa overnight or even within two nights or, for that matter, many times even in a week.

I strongly believe, as I have stated repeatedly, that the elimination of the patronage system governing the appointment of postmasters would provide, over a period of time, a needed improvement in the postal service and a sound incentive for career employees in the postal service.

The following statement by J. Edward Day, president of the National Civil Service League and former Postmaster General of the United States, and a policy statement of the organization which Mr. Day heads, discuss this question. The statement, I believe, presents a concise argument for the inclusion of postmasters in the existing merit system.

The House minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable GERALD FORD, felt this to be such a serious problem that he commented on it in his state of the Union speech last week. Mr. FORD stated:

We believe the Post Office Department should be taken out of politics from top to bottom. Republicans favor selecting all Postmasters on merit alone.

The civil service merit system has value. I see no reason why it cannot be applied to the appointment of post-

masters. I see no reason why it should not be applied to the appointment of postmasters. The adoption of a more businesslike and orderly approach to the selection of postmasters might very well be the first step in adopting a more businesslike and orderly approach to the movement of the mail.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this proposal, which I am reintroducing today. Although I introduced a similar bill in the 89th Congress, unfortunately no action was scheduled, no hearings were held on it. I am hopeful that the measure will be considered promptly.

The statement referred to follows:

POLICY STATEMENT—ABANDONING PATRONAGE IN POSTAL APPOINTMENTS

The United States Post Office is one of the world's best managed operations. Like every modern organization, it is faced with problems that impair its ability to give the best possible service. One serious deterrent to the Post Office's drive for quality is the archaic, inefficient system of appointing Postmasters and rural letter carriers through the old fashioned patronage system. Since 1881 the National Civil Service League has promoted government efficiency through modern merit systems of employment free from patronage and spoils. We believe the time is past due to rid the Federal government of this last great pool of patronage appointments. We believe the time has come for serious public discussion of how the postal service can be further improved by establishing a true merit system of Postmaster and rural letter carrier appointments. We welcome comments and help in this public service effort. (J. Edward Day, President, National Civil Service League.)

The National Civil Service League at this time once again forcefully reiterates its longstanding call for the elimination of the historic patronage system governing the appointment of postmasters and rural letter carriers by the Federal Government. The League urges elimination of the archaic practices of political appointment in the belief that the public climate is receptive to this long overdue reform and in the conviction that the general drive for efficiency and economy of Federal operations, sparked by President Johnson, is uniquely applicable to the multi-million dollar post office operations.

At no time has the postal service been faced with such critical public evaluation of its performance in delivering the mails. Technical improvements have been and are being made; but significantly contributing to the problem is the system of political preference which impairs the development of a corps of postal managers fully qualified for the high level managerial competence called for by one of the world's largest enterprises.

In the early years of the nation's political and commercial life, the mail was the sole organized system of communication and local post offices a few miles apart represented virtually the only outpost of Federal Government in vast reaches of the nation. Then the appointment of the postmaster by political favor could be rationalized with the argument that there was a need to bring government closer to the people through a local representative of the dominant political party.

However, the expansion of the Federal services in many fields and to all sectors of the country as well as the demand for superior managerial talent in postal administration makes the opportunistic appointment of postmasters through a system of political preference totally obsolete. Moreover, in the light of contemporary demands for postal service, the present system of postmaster appointment—upon political advice

with confirmation by the Senate—is no longer responsive either to postal or political considerations and no longer serves the Republic well. The time for urgent reform is already decades behind us.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

As President-elect in 1860, the first problem Abraham Lincoln tackled was which newspaper publisher in Chicago would be named postmaster. Publicly acknowledged and accepted at that time was the understanding that the publisher who backed the right candidate would be offered the local postmastership as his reward. Times have changed, yet the system of appointment based on the same relationship of local politics to postal patronage has survived through today.

In the nineteenth century the postmaster, as the only political appointee, was the Federal Government in many communities. That he was appointed by the incumbent administration and served a quasi-political local role far beyond delivery of the mail was, though inefficient, consonant with the Jacksonian concept of spoils and consistent with the practices of local political power structures.

At that time the professional demands of his job were small and the political demands were large. There was no other department of the government which provided a Federal presence in local communities. Furthermore, the political role of the postmaster evolved in an era in which every significant Federal position, including that of top military leadership, was filled by political preferment. Since 1883, however, under the stimulus of the civil service reform movement, all this has changed and the concept of merit in the public service has now become an accepted and cherished component of our governmental structure. Our Federal civil service has become renowned for the range of its services and the expertise of its personnel.

Yet, by a strange quirk of fate and time, the great civil service refinements of the early twentieth century bypassed the postmaster. As government and the postal system grew in complexity and importance, the postmaster remained in a sacrosanct back water. By the mid-20's, Postmaster General Hays could recognize the incongruity of the purely political appointee named in the tradition of local patronage but no longer responsive to the requirements of the job. It wasn't until 1937, however, that the increasingly complex postal operation persuaded the Roosevelt administration and the Congress, albeit with some reluctance, to move in the direction of reform.

The resultant Ramspeck-O'Mahoney Act placed all postmasters under the coverage of civil service once they had received Senate confirmation. This represented some ostensible advance. Yet the practical effect was to continue the anachronism of the political postmaster wholly alien to a modern management environment.

THE PRESENT SITUATION

The accepted current system for appointing postmasters is not widely known. In essence, the system superimposes political advice and preference upon the examination and qualification standards which generally apply to Federal civil service positions.

Under the Ramspeck-O'Mahoney Act enacted in 1938, postmasters of the first, second and third class are selected under civil service procedures with appointment by the President upon confirmation by the U.S. Senate. Thus, the Civil Service Commission is responsible for developing registers of qualified applicants through open competition for the position of local postmaster. The Commission has centralized post office examination functions in its Postal Examining Division. When a postmaster vacancy occurs, written examinations are given

for filling positions in PFS levels 5 through 9. For PFS level 10 and above, representing the larger communities, the competitive examination is unwritten and consists of a rating of the candidate's experience and qualifications against the established qualification standards, with verification of the applicants' claims in their applications. Following the rating process, the names of the top three eligibles are certified to the Postmaster General, who is authorized to select one of these subject to veterans' preference provisions. The Postmaster General recommends formal appointment by the President, who transmits his nominations for confirmation by the U.S. Senate. This description represents the formal procedure—what actually happens outside formal civil service channels is another story.

It is the requirement for Senate confirmation which draws the whole business of appointing postmasters into the political arena. The key to the procedure for selecting postmasters is the "advisor" system, which is in no way sanctioned or even recognized in law but which governs the process as surely as if it were written into the statutes. The advisor system rests on long tradition and historic precedent. The salient point here is that in de facto terms the advisor selects the local postmaster with the whole civil service procedure representing little more than a facade of false respectability.

A carefully accurate and up-to-date list of advisors is maintained in the Office of the Postmaster General. Usually the advisor is the local Congressman of the dominant party. By historic privilege, he reserves the right to "appoint" the local postmaster. Should the opposition party be in local power, then the advisor is a member of the majority party—a Senator, a State or County Chairman, or perhaps the Governor. Whoever the advisor may be, by well accepted political agreement, his word is law in this sphere and all other parties are bound to support the choice of the advisor.

Thus, when a vacancy occurs in a postmastership by resignation, retirement or death, the first one likely to know is the local county chairman of the political party then in power in Washington. Sometimes the local chairman hears directly from the Post Office, however informally, or if the outgoing postmaster is of the same political faith, the chairman may well be alerted long before the established postal authorities are aware that there will be a vacancy. The district Congressman, Senators and other political leaders in the state then get the word fast. Ultimately, the notice of a vacancy filters through to the Civil Service Commission by way of official post office channels.

A strangely schizophrenic pattern then follows. On the one hand, the Post Office Department arranges for an examination with the Civil Service Commission and is concerned with matters of qualification standards, nature of the examination, veterans' preference, and the like. At the same time, the local political organization is deeply locked in negotiations over the recommendation it shall make to the designated Congressional advisor, who in turn will impart the distilled wisdom of this procedure to the Post Office as governing the ultimate selection. These decision-makers unfortunately give but scant attention to the civil service standards being solemnly proclaimed by the Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission.

A whole lexicon of euphemistic jargon has grown up to obscure the formal procedure. First, obviously, an acting postmaster must be named while the formalities of civil service selection procedures are being pursued. The advisor, in fact, names the temporary postmaster and there is no requirement that he meet any qualification standards because of the temporary nature of his appointment.

But now begins the procedure of examinations solemnly conducted, often in some embarrassment by the Civil Service Commission. Thus, the permanent postmaster will be chosen from among the first three in a competitive examination unless, despite the Hatch Act, a career employee has achieved sufficient political stature to be recommended. It is at this point that the whole charade begins, turning the formal civil service process into a mockery. For, while the choice will be made among the top three in the examination, it becomes clear quite early that the political advisor will make that choice.

There are a number of other devices for making sure that the politically favored candidate finally gets the post.

Sometimes the examination has to be given more than once over a long period of time because available "advice" cannot recommend any of those who emerged from the examination among the top three.

New examinations are called for on technical grounds until the "right" name shows up.

Sometimes postal delivery areas have to be redrawn to assure the eligibility for examination of the person who, predictably, will be the beneficiary of the proper advice—or, conversely, to eliminate the better qualified individuals.

Sometimes the acting postmaster, already politically endorsed, is in office for a sufficiently long time for his experience as an incumbent to boost him into the top three on a subsequent examination so that once again advice can be pertinent.

The entire procedure, remarkable in its cynicism and even more remarkable in its transparency, often goes on for many months. Finally, the advisor's recommendation, gratefully received by a Post Office Department whose local office has been in a state of inefficient turmoil during this entire tedious process, finally appears on a long list of names which goes to the White House. From there the nomination goes to the Senate of the United States.

The President's nominations are referred to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which in turn reports the names of the nominees to both Senators from the subject states. At this point Senatorial courtesy takes over and no further move is made on the President's nominations until both Senators give notification that they have no objection to any of the recommended postmasters in their states. The senior Senator of the dominant party, prior to his no objection clearance, will refer the particular nominee to the advisor, who is likely to be his colleague in the other House. This serves as a double check, and the Senator does not release the name until he is satisfied that the person on the President's list is actually the selectee of the Congressman or other advisor. This solidifies the whole process and gives absolute assurance as to the political reliability of the nominee.

Finally, the entire Senate of the United States votes on the nominee who has been so scrupulously selected by his political peers. With the advice and consent of the Senate, a postmaster has now been chosen. Unfortunately, the results, after all this passage of time and slow grinding of mills, all too often give the postal establishment a local manager far less qualified than standard civil service procedures could provide in much less time, at much less expenditure, and with far less theatrics.

DEFICIENCIES OF THE PRESENT SYSTEM

Not surprisingly, the postmaster selected in this fashion is something short of the complete product of the civil service structure. Once confirmed by the Senate, he automatically achieves full civil service status. All of the fringe benefits, retirement advantages, and similar emoluments which

the majority of public servants earn through the years of their progress through the ranks become his by fiat. His civil service tenure rights protect him from dismissal except for deficiencies of character or performance under civil service procedures.

The present system is inconsistent with the whole concept of merit in government employment. There is simply no assurance that the best or near best is finally chosen for the job.

The system has the potential for operating as a depressant on the morale and aspirations of the many devoted, able and experienced subordinate postal officers in local centers. They cannot aspire to the top of the hierarchy in the local office because this post is reserved for political appointment. Thus, an artificial ceiling is imposed on opportunities for advancement except in those occasional instances where a subordinate employee gains political favor and is the recipient of political preferment.

The system contributes to a political, non-professional atmosphere that tends to discourage young, vigorous talent from making careers in the postal service. Bright young men rarely consider seeking appointment in the Post Office Department. Yet this is precisely the type of person the Department requires. The available pool of talent shrinks yearly.

The system fosters a political climate in the post offices of our local communities with postal employees tending to assume a coloration of political activity sharply different from their civil service associates in other departments. Not only does the postmaster enter the career service through a back door in the system, but the manner of his selection erodes the prestige of the service among the largest single group of classified employees in the government.

The system absorbs the time of high officials who should be concerned with operating problems rather than devoting excessive energy in the endless negotiation and maneuvering incident to the processes of political conciliation. Even the President is not immune to these drains on his precious time. The system places the Civil Service Commission in the anomalous position of participating in a travesty on the concept of merit in public employment.

It may be further noted that on occasion politically appointed postmasters with strong and active political backing tend to feel they can resist supervision by headquarters superiors. This is particularly true since the creation during the past decade of regional offices staffed with career personnel. Such conflict of loyalties clearly impairs good management.

One further problem of vital importance deserves mention: The statutes impose a residence requirement on the appointment of all postmasters. This automatically requires that only local residents can be considered for any postmaster vacancy. Thus, the system does not permit flexible utilization and advancement of those postmasters who, whatever the defects of the political appointment process, prove in fact to be capable postal administrators. They cannot be advanced to higher responsibilities by transfer to another large city under present statutory limitations which were originally put in the law to protect the right of political designation by the local party.

It should also be noted that the advisor system described earlier for postmasters is used in selections to fill vacancies among the 35,000 rural letter carriers even though no Senate confirmation is involved. While these men do not have management responsibilities and the qualifications are different from those of postmasters, the retention of political selection is an anachronism which has no place in the Federal personnel system. The League, therefore, strongly urges the end of the advisor system for rural letter carriers as well as postmasters.

THE MYTH OF POSTAL PATRONAGE AS A SOURCE OF POLITICAL STRENGTH

The sanctity of the patronage system applying to postmasters has been passed from Congressman to Congressman and from party to party with all the untouchability of a graven tablet. Both its ethics and its effectiveness in practical political terms have been little discussed. Yet the notion that the right to name local postmasters and rural letter carriers represents an undeniable source of political strength to political leaders is distinctly a myth.

Thus, the modern, sophisticated politician knows that the patronage system often creates enemies of those who do not succeed in getting one of the few plums the system offers. Even the favored appointee may become an ingrate and the whole system often opens rifts in party ranks. To name one of the best as Postmaster, the party sacrifices his talent under the strict dictates of the Hatch Act. To name less than their best, the party runs the risk of identification with a local post office performing under second rate management.

The subterfuges and anomalies of the present advisory charade are becoming apparent to an increasing number of Congressmen. Many are now side stepping their advisory role. They either seek a career man to recommend or make an effort to put the burden on the Post Office with a truly open competitive examination. But at the local level the tradition dies harder. It is the local or county political organization of both parties as well as the member of Congress who must be sold on reform.

Another disadvantage of the present system concerns the diversion of legislative time entailed. While the total time devoted to postmaster confirmation in the Senate—two floor actions and a single committee action on each group of nominees—seems relatively brief, the assumption is deceptive. Approximately one postmastership in every sixteen becomes vacant annually. For each, the Congressional advisor and his staff devote an enormous amount of time in correspondence with applicants, with the Post Office, and with their local political organizations. Often trips and conferences at home and with party officials go on for weeks and not infrequently for months. Members of the Senate and House postal committees who have a policy role in all aspects of the career service become the focal point of advisory pressure. This deep and continual involvement of Congressional committees and their staffs in postmaster patronage not only consumes much of their time but also a negative effect on the creditability of the same personnel as guardians of the career-merit concept.

For all these reasons—the myth of political advantage, the inordinate diversion of time, and the growing realization of the need for top management strength—there is a mounting readiness in the Congress for reform on this front. We are particularly encouraged by the recent strong recommendation of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, co-chaired by Senator Mike Monroney of Oklahoma, that the patronage system applying to postmasters and rural mail carriers be finally and unequivocally abandoned. Many other legislators have submitted bills to this end.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The entire history of the civil service, the postal establishment and the political system demands the elimination of this throwback to the last century. The following steps are basic essentials to effecting the elimination of the political appointment of postmasters and improving postal management:

(1) Repeal of the statutory requirement for confirmation of postmasters by the U.S. Senate and abandonment of the advisor process.

(2) Provision for appointment to postmaster rank exclusively through the merit system based on open competitive or promotional examination conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

(3) Elimination of the resident requirement and granting limited authority to transfer incumbent postmasters to other post offices.

(4) Elimination of the advisor system for appointing rural letter carriers and selection strictly through civil service merit procedures.

The ultimate tragedy of the postmaster system today is its simple failure to produce the kind of person the post office most needs. We urge the President to initiate and the Congress to enact these long overdue reforms.

FARMERS SAY "CEASE AND DESIST"

Mr. ERLÉNBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining with a number of other farm-State Representatives in sponsoring legislation calling on the Government to "cease and desist" from actions depressing farm prices. Our congressional directive to the executive branch of Government instructs the Government to use various legislative authorities to improve farm prices and to build a strong, viable market economy for agriculture.

This bill is similar to one I introduced in the last session expressing the sense of Congress that Government should take no action whatsoever which would prevent farm prices from rising to full parity.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent from the recent Department of Defense order calling for butter substitutes in military rations that the administration is still attempting to hold down farm prices. Several of our colleagues in the Senate earlier this month wrote Defense Secretary Robert McNamara protesting this latest butterfat curtailment.

Experts interested in the welfare of the dairy industry have indicated this one Government action will deprive dairy farmers of a market for about 50 million pounds of butter annually. Yet no money is being saved, since the Commodity Credit Corporation is expected to spend some \$33 million to cover the Defense Department's \$28 million saving.

At a time the dairy industry is beset with skyrocketing costs and income still well below parity, this kind of Government price manipulation should be stopped in its tracks.

The House concurrent resolution which we are introducing today notes that American farmers are still being used as scapegoats of inflation in spite of statistics showing realized net farm income will decline by at least 5 percent during 1967.

The resolution lists 10 specific reasons for the decline, including:

Inflationary domestic fiscal policies which have increased farm production costs 19 percent since 1952;
Market price manipulation which has

decreased prices received by farmers 6 percent since 1962;

Dumping of huge quantities of grain upon the domestic market;

Increasing imports of raw sugar, cheese and other farm products to lower domestic prices;

Stimulating increased production of wheat and feed grains without adequate price incentives.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope this resolution will receive earliest consideration. With farm parity at 77 percent, we can ill afford more price-depressing moves by the administration.

THE CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH THE SOVIET UNION—AN ISSUE FOR THE 1968 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANDRUM). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dangerous proposals which will come before the 90th Congress is the so-called Consular Treaty.

On Monday of this week, January 23, the U.S. Senate began hearings on the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union. This is the second time in recent years that the Senate has considered this measure, the Foreign Relations Committee having first approved it in 1965, but final action by the Senate was never taken.

I opposed the Consular Treaty then, and I am more opposed than ever. It borders on idiocy to appease Communist overlords in Moscow who are directly and indirectly responsible for aggression, subversion, and atrocities, while at the same time 400,000 Americans in Vietnam are trying to stem the tide of Communist conquest in southeast Asia.

It will be recalled that a statement by Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI provided the impetus for much opposition to the consular agreement and was undoubtedly a major reason why the measure was never brought to the Senate floor for action. At that time Mr. Hoover, in referring to the use of official personnel by the Soviets for intelligence purposes, said:

Our Government is about to allow them to establish consulates in many parts of the country which, of course, will make our work more difficult.

In addition to the above statement, Mr. Hoover at that time referred again to new Soviet consulates in a written statement which was included in the hearings. The statement read:

Long seeking greater official representation in the United States which would be more widely spread over the country, a cherished goal of the Soviet intelligence services was realized when the United States signed an agreement with the Soviet Union on June 1, 1964, providing for the reciprocal establishment of consulates in our respective countries.

One Soviet intelligence officer in commenting on the agreement spoke of the wonderful opportunity this presented his service and that it would enable the Soviets to enhance their intelligence operations.

Nor were these the only references to Soviet intelligence operations in the

United States made by Director Hoover. He referred to the Soviet "illegal"—deep cover—operations in the United States in these words:

A growing problem is the extent to which the Soviet intelligence services are dispatching undercover spies into the United States. These individuals have no ostensible connection with either the official Soviet establishments or personnel in this country nor do they make any overt contacts with their foreign espionage headquarters. They are well-trained, professional intelligence officers and usually bear assumed identities and are supplied with expertly fabricated documents and unlimited funds. They enter the United States without difficulty to become assimilated into our population and, unless uncovered, eventually serve as the nucleus of an extensive clandestine espionage network. Their detection among the more than 190 million people in this country is a counter-intelligence problem of great magnitude.

If these statements by the Director are not sufficient evidence of the very real danger of Soviet intelligence operations in our country, one might consider additional information supplied by Mr. Hoover during these same hearings. Included as vehicles of Soviet intelligence action in the United States were the East-West exchange program, press representatives, Amtorg Trading Corp., and personnel at the United Nations. Included at the end of these remarks is the statement of Mr. Hoover concerning the above references.

Much has appeared in the press in the last 2 weeks concerning inquiries made by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT regarding Mr. Hoover's remarks on the proposed consular arrangement in 1965. There has been much confusion as to whether Mr. Hoover has actually taken a stand, one way or the other, on the advisability of the Consular Convention. Any doubts concerning this issue should have been laid to rest last Monday when Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, read into the RECORD a reply from Mr. Hoover concerning Mr. Hoover's 1965 statement. In the interest of clarification I am also including at the end of these remarks the texts of Senator MUNDT's inquiry and Mr. Hoover's reply.

Of special interest in this paragraph from Mr. Hoover's letter of January 23, 1967, to Senator MUNDT with regard to Soviet intelligence operations:

You asked whether these efforts by communist diplomatic personnel still continue. They most certainly do. Representatives of the KGB (Soviet Committee of State Security) and the GRU (Soviet Military Intelligence Service), comprising a large segment of the Soviet diplomatic corps in the United States, are conducting an intensive campaign aimed at the most sensitive data regarding our scientific and technical developments, our military and defense programs and the future plans of our Government.

To give some idea of the extent of Soviet intelligence action in the United States, there have been since 1957, 28 Soviet officials arrested or expelled for having attempted to engage in subversion or espionage in our Nation.

Couple this figure with a listing of court cases from 1960 through 1966 in which violations of espionage and passport statutes were involved. Most of those involved were American citizens

who conspired with Soviet officials and other Soviet personnel for the most part in the United States. The listing of cases is included at the end of my remarks. Note the severity of most of the sentences meted out to further appreciate the seriousness of this issue.

These cases involve only the Soviet Union. As the consular convention involves only the Soviet Union, particular reference has been made to the U.S.S.R. and not the other Soviet-bloc countries. This does not mean that the other Soviet-bloc countries do not engage in similar activities in the United States. For instance, in 1966 Frank John Mrkva, an employee of the Department of State, cooperated with the FBI when approached by Jiri Opatrny, a Czech intelligence agent assigned to the Czech Embassy in Washington, D.C. Mrkva was requested to install an electronic listening device in a State Department office. Opatrny was declared persona non grata on July 13, 1966, and has departed the United States. It is an established fact that the U.S.S.R. is the force that pulls the strings in satellite countries and many activities of agents such as Opatrny could undoubtedly be traced to Communist masters in Moscow.

The immensity of the threat to our national security which is presented by the Soviet Union, in conjunction with the other bloc countries—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Outer Mongolia, Poland, and Rumania—should not be underestimated. Just last year, in February, Mr. Hoover again emphasized the magnitude of the task which faces the FBI in coping with this threat:

The work of the official representatives of the Soviet-bloc countries who are assigned to the United States is being supplemented to an increasing degree by the "illegal", deep cover intelligence agents who are being dispatched into this country.

This, for example, may be an individual who enters the country among a group of refugees. It might be an individual who enters as an immigrant. On the other hand, it might be someone already in this country who was recruited here by the foreign intelligence services. For the individual just arriving in this country, he may take no overt action on behalf of his foreign master for many years, becoming well assimilated into our way of life in the meantime.

These individuals usually bear assumed identities; are supplied with documents, usually false but always expertly fabricated, which a person in this country would normally have in his possession so as to bolster the assumed identity; and make no open contact with known representatives of the foreign governments which they serve.

The detection of these undercover spies constitutes a time-consuming, tedious investigative problem.

I continue to quote Director Hoover at length, for information of this type is usually unknown to even the most knowledgeable of American citizens:

In their intelligence-gathering operations, the Communist-bloc countries have a seemingly inexhaustible supply of funds. In carrying out their relentless quest, there is virtually no phase of our national life which goes unexplored. A list of material which they seek would constitute a voluminous catalog of life in the United States. The emphasis, of course, is on scientific, technological, military, and industrial data which will strengthen the Soviet bloc. At the same time, however, they are alert for any and all infor-

mation—classified or unclassified—which will enable them to weaken the United States through propaganda or subversion.

As a result of several decades of development, the coordinated espionage attack against this country by the intelligence services of the Communist bloc has now reached an intensity which makes it the most massive offensive of its kind ever mounted.

U.S.S.R. PROMISES REVIEWED

Now, after viewing the extent of Soviet intelligence and espionage activities in the United States, it would be well to review the promise the Soviets made to the United States in the very first agreement made between the two countries back in 1933. Paragraph 2 of the letter sent to President Roosevelt by the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Maxim Litvinoff, just prior to the establishment of diplomatic relations. Litvinoff, for the Soviet Union, promised:

To refrain, and to restrain all persons in government service and all organizations of the Government or under its direct or indirect control, including the organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from it, from any act overt or covert liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquillity, prosperity, order or security of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions, and in particular, from any act tending to incite or encourage armed intervention, or any agitation or propaganda having as an aim, the violation of the territorial integrity of the United States, its territories or possessions, or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions.

What a huge joke has been played on Uncle Sam, or to put it more exactly—Uncle Sucker. It is distressing enough to consider how we have been deceived in the past, but to entertain the idea of sweeping this all under the rug and entering a new agreement with the Soviet Union is utter idiocy. Only a soft and appeasing State Department, with eyes closed to past treaty failures and broken promises, would make such a proposal as the Consular Treaty in 1967.

The question should not be whether to ratify the consular convention, but what are we going to do about the Soviet activities referred to above by Mr. Hoover. Instead of ignoring the present situation outlined by Director Hoover, Mr. Dean Rusk and the State Department should be talking to the Soviets about their Soviet agents in the United States.

A 50-YEAR GOAL UNCHANGED

Another and more basic question has also been ignored in considering the consular convention; namely, what is the basic goal or purpose of the Communist movement with regard to the United States and other free countries of the world. For years the Soviets have been telling us that peace will come to the world only after the International Communist movement is in control of every nation on the face of this earth. Many choose to ignore or explain away this basic Soviet goal. As recently as January 4 of this year, the Communist leaders in Moscow again spelled out their goal. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union issued a lengthy statement, entitled, "On Preparations for the 50th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution," which appeared in the publication Mos-

cow News in an English translation. Remembering that the Soviet October revolution initiated the greatest series of blood baths ever visited upon mankind in all recorded history, this quote from the Central Committee's statement is a warning for all free men:

The October Revolution showed a way of solving the vital problems brought to the fore by preceding world history: on the future of society, on the nature of social progress, on war and peace, on the destinies of world civilization.

The victory of the October Revolution confirmed the Leninist theory of socialist revolution. Marxist-Leninist teaching had been proved correct: on the inevitability of the collapse of capitalism and its replacement by socialism; on the vanguard role of the working class, led by the Communist Party, in the Revolution and in building a new society; on the dictatorship of the proletariat and its role in the struggle for the victory of socialism.

As any student of communism knows, the above reference to socialism is, in Communist jargon, another way of saying communism.

As can be seen, then, from the Soviets' own statement, proclaimed as late as January 4 of this year, the bloody October revolution which provided the impetus for the slaughter of millions of human beings in various countries during the last 50 years, showed a way of solving vital world problems—the future of society, war and peace, and the destinies of world civilization. The means for solving these problems is, of course Lenin's theory of socialist—Communist, that is—revolution. The heart of their drive is subversion and further penetration of the last real bastion of the free world, the United States of America. It is, indeed, a tragedy that our already discredited State Department advocates giving more bases for subversion and penetration to the U.S.S.R. in their consular treaty. The American people must be alerted to this danger before it is too late.

Although foreign policy can be a very complex area at times, it doesn't take a foreign policy expert to realize that something is wrong when we continue to make concessions to a nation that is helping to kill American boys in South Vietnam. Surely it is reasonable to consider the Soviet SAM sites, the Soviet Migs, the Soviet personnel and other forms of Soviet help to North Vietnam when we think about further agreements with the Soviet Union.

The consideration of a consular convention is premature at this time until the State Department explains to the American people (a) how we can justify the killing of American boys in Vietnam with the help of the Soviet Union while at the same time considering the ratification of another agreement with the same Soviet Union; (b) what is going to be done about the increasing subversion of the United States by the Soviet Union as described by J. Edgar Hoover; (c) why make more concessions to a movement which is actively working for the collapse of capitalism and its replacement by communism, thus bringing to an end the existence of the United States of America as we know it today.

I include the documents heretofore

referred, to be put in the RECORD at this point:

EXCHANGE OF LETTERS BETWEEN SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT AND DIRECTOR J. EDGAR HOOVER IN JANUARY 1967, REGARDING THE PROPOSED CONSULAR CONVENTION

JANUARY 21, 1967.

Mr. J. EDGAR HOOVER,
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDGAR: I am both concerned and confused over the various interpretations being given to your reply to the letter written by you by Secretary of State Rusk on September 14 with regard to the position of the FBI on the probable consequences likely to result from ratification of the Consular Treaty now before the United States Senate. Inasmuch as I am one of the five Senators alluded to by Secretary Rusk's letter as having in mind your testimony of March 4, 1965 when we signed our minority report, I am understandably eager to know your precise position because the whole matter is now again before our Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Hearings will begin next Monday morning.

It was my interpretation of your views and testimony when I helped prepare the Minority Views which we signed that you were not counseling the Congress on all possible ramifications of the so-called Consular Treaty but that as the Director of the FBI charged with protecting the internal security of the United States you were very properly pointing out the increased dangers and likelihood of subversive actions by foreign communists if they were brought to this country in increased numbers and granted extended immunity. That was my interpretation of your views and it remains so today and I see nothing in the exchange of letters between Secretary Rusk and you which either indicates you have changed your views as presented to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on March 4 or that you are retracting the warning signs which you flashed about the probability of increased challenges to our security here in the United States which would "make our (the FBI's) work more difficult." Was I in error in my original interpretation of your testimony or in the way I continue to interpret it today?

Specifically may I inquire of you:

(1) Have you in any way changed your views or has any evidence developed since your testimony of March 4, 1965 to make you change your mind about your testimony concerning subversive actions by communist diplomats as you related it and the fact that added communist diplomatic personnel in our midst with extended immunities would necessarily "make your work more difficult" in meeting the responsibilities of the FBI?

(2) Since March 4, 1965, has there been a cessation of attempts by communist diplomatic personnel in this country to engage in acts of subversion or attempted espionage? Do these efforts still continue? Can you supply me a list of these attempts as they are available for public information, segregated by calendar years, over the past six to ten years?

Finally, Edgar, let me say that as I read the exchange of letters between you and Secretary Rusk, I feel you have reiterated precisely the interpretation which I placed on your testimony at the time I helped prepare our Minority Views for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in 1965, but due to the very much expanded and inclusive interpretations being placed upon these letters by some others, I would like to receive from you a reply to this letter and the questions presented so that there can be no misunderstanding on the part of any who are concerned.

Since our Senate Hearings on the Consular Treaty begin on Monday morning, I would deeply appreciate it if you could have your reply delivered by hand by Monday noon if

this is possible; if not, the earlier I receive the letter the better opportunity we shall have to keep the record straight and clear.

With warmest personal regards, I am
Cordially yours,
KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senator.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., January 23, 1967.

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR KARL: I have received your letter of January 21, 1967, in which you advised that you are concerned and confused over the various interpretations being given to my letter of September 16, 1966, to the Secretary of State Rusk, "with regard to the position of the FBI on the probable consequences likely to result from ratification of the Consular Treaty now before the United States Senate."

It should be clearly understood that the FBI is the investigative arm of the Department of Justice and, as such, it is our responsibility to gather and report facts. The FBI is not a policy-making agency and we do not express opinions. Since 1924, when I became its Director, the FBI has refrained from injecting itself into the area of legislation. The Consular Convention between the Soviet Union and the United States, which is now before the United States Senate, is no exception to this long-standing rule.

Because the Consular Convention does involve considerations which have a direct bearing upon the responsibilities of the FBI, I appreciate your interest in requesting the following facts from me. Again I emphasize that the FBI is not recommending a course of action or expressing an opinion.

You specifically inquired whether I had changed my views or whether any evidence has developed to make me change my mind about my testimony of March 4, 1965. The answer is an unequivocal no.

During my testimony before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on March 4, 1965, I called attention to the fact that the establishment of Soviet consulates in this country, "of course, will make our work more difficult." At no point in my March, 1965, testimony—nor following the release of that testimony by the House Appropriations Committee in May, 1965—did I state or imply that the Consular Convention would impose any additional burdens of responsibility upon the FBI that we are incapable of handling. Nor did I express any opinion concerning the matter of ratification. The simple fact is that the work of the FBI in combating Soviet-directed espionage activities in this country has increased through the years commensurate with the increase in Soviet representation here. I can also state without equivocation that communist-bloc diplomatic establishments in this country serve as focal points for intelligence operations.

You inquired whether, since March 4, 1965, there has been a cessation of attempts by communist diplomatic personnel in this country to engage in acts of subversion or attempted espionage. The answer again is an unequivocal no.

You asked whether these efforts by communist diplomatic personnel still continue. They most certainly do. Representatives of the KGB (Soviet Committee of State Security) and the GRU (Soviet Military Intelligence Service), comprising a large segment of the Soviet diplomatic corps in the United States, are conducting an intensive campaign aimed at the most sensitive data regarding our scientific and technical developments, our military and defense programs and the future plans of our Government.

You requested that you be supplied with a list of attempts by communist diplomatic personnel to engage in acts of subversion or attempted espionage as they are available for

public information, segregated by calendar years over the past six to ten years. In accordance with your request, there is attached a list of Soviet officials stationed in this country who have been arrested or expelled from the United States since January 1, 1957. With every good wish,
Sincerely,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

SOVIET OFFICIALS STATIONED IN THE UNITED STATES WHO HAVE BEEN ARRESTED OR EXPELLED SINCE JANUARY 1, 1957

Aleksey R. Malinin, Employee, Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C., October 31, 1966.

Valentin A. Revin, Third Secretary, Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C., September 1, 1966.

Stefan M. Kirsanov, First Secretary, Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C., June 1, 1965.

Boris V. Karpovich, Counselor, Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C., January 7, 1965.

Vladimir P. Grechanin, Assistant Military Attache, Washington, D.C., December 14, 1964.

Aleksandr V. Udalov, Assistant Air Attache, Washington, D.C., December 14, 1964.

Vasily V. Zadivinsky, Military Attache, Washington, D.C., December 14, 1964.

Vladimir I. Olenev, Employee, Soviet United Nations Mission, New York City, October 30, 1963.

Yuri A. Romashin, Third Secretary, Soviet United Nations Mission, New York City, October 30, 1963.

Gleb A. Pavlov, Attache, Soviet United Nations Mission, New York City, October 30, 1963.

Igor A. Ivanov, Chauffeur, Amtorg Trading Corporation, New York City, October 29, 1963.

Ivan D. Egorov, Employee, United Nations Secretariat, New York City, October 11, 1963.

Aleksandra I. Egorova, Wife of Ivan D. Egorov, October 11, 1963.

Gennadiy G. Sevastyanov, Attache, Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C., July 1, 1963.

Yevgeni M. Prokhorov, Second Secretary, Soviet United Nations Mission, New York City, September 29, 1962.

Ivan Y. Vyrodov, Third Secretary, Soviet United Nations Mission, New York City, September 29, 1962.

Yuri V. Zaitsev, Attache, Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C., August 3, 1962.

Igor Y. Melekh, Employee, United Nations Secretariat, New York City, March 24, 1961.

Valentin M. Ivanov, First Secretary, Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C., August 13, 1960.

Petr Y. Ezhov, Third Secretary, Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C., July 22, 1960.

Vadim A. Kirilyuk, Employee, United Nations Secretariat, New York City, December 17, 1959.

Yevgeny A. Zastrovtsev, Second Secretary, Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C., May 13, 1959.

Kirill S. Doronkin, Employee, United Nations Secretariat, New York City, January 15, 1959.

Nikolai I. Kurochkin, Third Secretary, Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C., June 6, 1958.

Gennadiy F. Mashkantsev, Employee, Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C., April 17, 1957.

Vladimir A. Grusha, First Secretary, Soviet Mission to the United Nations, New York City, March 25, 1957.

Vasily M. Molev, Employee, Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C., January 25, 1957.

Yuri P. Krylov, Assistant Military Attache, Washington, D.C., January 14, 1957.

OTHER MEANS USED BY THE SOVIET UNION TO BRING INTELLIGENCE PERSONNEL INTO THE UNITED STATES AS CITED BY DIRECTOR J. EDGAR HOOVER IN HIS MARCH 4, 1965, TESTIMONY BEFORE A HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

East-West Exchange Program—The numerous Soviet scientific delegations which arrive

in the United States to tour U.S. universities and scientific establishments invariably have among their members Soviet scientists who have been given special assignments by the KGB. It is established Soviet policy that among such groups are one or more full-time KGB officers who are in charge of the delegations.

Upon returning, Soviet scientists who have visited the United States under the exchange program are required by the KGB to submit comprehensive reports on the technical aspects of their trip, including descriptions of installations visited, research being conducted and the status of particular projects. They must also submit reports concerning Americans contacted for possible future use by the KGB.

Students—As to the students, many of the Soviet exchange students attending colleges and universities in the United States are utilized as agents by the KGB. Having the responsibility of obtaining any information of intelligence interest, they photograph (or deliver to their KGB superiors for photographing) documents and scientific papers to which they have access as students.

Of the Soviet students in the United States for the school term beginning in the fall of 1964, over 20 percent were suspected of being agents with specific KGB assignments or officers of the Soviet intelligence services.

Press representatives—Press cover is tailored for the intelligence work of the Soviets. They are in a business in which they are expected to be where news is developing, to meet those persons having intimate knowledge, to ask questions and to seek information.

As of February 1, 1965, over half of the Soviet nationals posing as press representatives in the United States were known to be intelligence agents.

Amtorg Trading Corp.—Disguising their intelligence personnel as legitimate trade representatives has long been a tactic of the Soviet intelligence services. The official cover utilized enables such personnel to travel extensively and meet many persons associated with fields of special intelligence interest.

Over half of the Soviet nationals employed by the Amtorg Trading Corp. in New York City on February 1, 1965, were known or suspected to be actually connected with the Soviet intelligence services.

United Nations—Fully exploiting their diplomatic immunity, freedom from travel restrictions and the respectability enjoyed as members of an international organization dedicated to world peace, the Soviet intelligence services have continued to increase their use of employment with the United Nations as a cover for their espionage personnel.

On July 1, 1960, there were 32 Soviet official personnel assigned to the United Nations Secretariat. By February 1, 1965, the number had mounted to 108, of whom half were agents or officers of the Soviet intelligence services.

LISTING OF COURT CASES INVOLVING AMERICAN CITIZENS AND OTHERS IN COMPLICITY WITH THE SOVIET UNION IN VIOLATION OF ESPIONAGE AND PASSPORT STATUTES FROM 1960 THROUGH 1966

1. Igor Y. Melekh and Willie Hirsch, indicted on three counts with conspiracy to violate Section 793(a) (b) (c) and Section 951 of Title 18, U.S. Code. On motion by Government, court altered the bond of Igor Melekh, a United Nations employee, to permit him to leave the United States. Upon further motion by the Government, court dismissed the indictment on April 11, 1961, as to Melekh and Hirsch.

2. Robert Soblen, convicted for violation of espionage statutes and sentenced to life imprisonment on August 7, 1961. Free on appeal, Soblen unlawfully fled the United States and subsequently committed suicide in England.

3. Arthur Rogers Roddey, pled guilty to violations of espionage statutes and sentenced to eight years imprisonment on February 17, 1961.

4. Irvin C. Scarbeck, charged with unauthorized transmittal of classified information to an agent of a foreign government. Convicted and sentenced to 30 years imprisonment in 1961. In 1963 sentence was reduced to 10 years by District Court.

5. Nelson C. Drummond, indicted on two counts in October, 1962, convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment for having conspired with four Soviet Nationals, all former members of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations to deliver information relating to the national defense of the United States to the U.S.S.R.

6. Ivan Dmitrievich Egorov, Aleksandra Ivanovna Egorov, Robert K. Baltch and Joy Ann Baltch, indicted on charge of conspiring to transmit information about rocket launching sites, atomic weapons in shipments, and other aspects of national defense to the Soviet Union. Egorov, a Soviet National, was employed by United Nations Secretariat, but his claim of diplomatic immunity was denied by court. Prior to trial, the Egorov's were exchanged for two Americans, a Jesuit priest and a student, who were being held by the Soviets in U.S.S.R. The Baltches, alias Sokolovs were dismissed from a new indictment at the request of the Attorney General whose action was prompted by overriding considerations of national security. They departed from United States on October 15, 1964.

7. John William Butenko and Igor A. Ivanov, a Soviet National, convicted of conspiracy to violate espionage statutes and sentenced to 30 and 20 years imprisonment respectively in December 1964.

8. Robert Glenn Thompson, indicted on charge of obtaining information for the Soviet Union on U.S. military installations, missile sites, code books and intelligence and counterintelligence activities, including the identity of American agents. Pled guilty and sentenced to 30 years imprisonment last year.

9. Robert Lee Johnson and James Allen Mintkenbaugh, indicted on charges of conspiring to commit espionage on behalf of Soviet Union. Pled guilty and sentenced to 25 years imprisonment each in 1965.

10. Paul Carl Meyer, pled guilty on four counts of misuse of American passports. On February 26, 1965, was sentenced to 2 years' imprisonment on the first of these counts and to 1 year each on the remaining three counts, these sentences to run concurrently. Meyer fraudulently obtained 15 passports in Chicago, traveled to Berlin and sold passports to Soviets.

11. William Henry Whalen, a retired United States Army Lieutenant Colonel, indicted for violation of the Espionage Statutes. Whalen, who had been the subject of an extensive investigation by the FBI, entered a plea of guilty to the charges on December 16, 1966, and is presently awaiting sentence.

12. Herbert William Boeckenhaupt, a Sergeant in the United States Air Force, charged with conspiring with a Soviet Embassy employee to transmit to the Soviet Union information relating to the national defense of the United States. The Soviet Embassy employee was declared persona non grata (Aleksey R. Malinin), and Boeckenhaupt is presently awaiting trial after having been indicted by a Federal Grand Jury on December 16, 1966.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. ERLÉN-BORN), for 60 minutes, today; to revise

and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROUSH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TENZER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ERLÉN-BORN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PIRNIE.

Mr. PELL.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BRINKLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 30, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 or rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

275. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) transmitting a report of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain additional facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, pursuant to the provision of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1), and pursuant to the authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

276. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) transmitting a report of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain additional facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1), and to the authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

277. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

278. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Battle Act Report of 1966, pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

279. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of review of geodetic surveying activities within the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

280. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a proposed concession contract authorizing the operation of medical facilities and maintain a general medical practice in five areas of Yellowstone National Park, pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

281. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the fifth annual report on the problem of air pollution caused by motor vehicles, and measures taken toward its alleviation, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87-272; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

282. Secretary-Treasurer, Congressional Medal of Honor Society, United States of America, transmitting the annual financial report of the society for the calendar year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

283. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report of the estimated amount of losses or costs (or percentage of costs) incurred by the postal service in the performance of public services during fiscal year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87-793; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

284. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report concerning positions in the U.S. General Accounting Office in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, during calendar year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 5114; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

285. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration transmitting a report indicating proposed actions to conduct certain programs at levels in excess of those authorized, pursuant to the provisions of 80 Stat. 336; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 3890. A bill to require all insured banks to clear checks at par; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3891. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 3892. A bill to permit States or other duly constituted taxing authorities to subject persons to liability for payment of property taxes on property located in Federal areas within such States under specified conditions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3893. A bill to establish certain policies with respect to certain use permits for national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 3894. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3895. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an 8-percent across-the-board benefit increase, with subsequent benefit increases based on rises in the cost of living, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for such tax increases as may be necessary to finance any of such benefit increases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 3896. A bill to provide for the control of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease through research, technical assistance, and grants-in-aid for control projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 3897. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow who has minor children, and is entitled to mother's insurance benefits, may earn without suffering deductions from the benefits to which

she is entitled thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3898. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 3899. A bill to amend section 407 of the Social Security Act to extend for 5 years the existing temporary authority to provide aid to families with dependent children in cases where the parent is unemployed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3900. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property of the New Amsterdam Casualty Co. for inclusion in the Independence National Historical Park, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3901. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3902. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3903. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that pensions paid to retired law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 3904. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that servicemen traveling on leave, furlough, or pass shall be exempt from the excise tax on transportation by air; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 3905. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,500 to \$2,400 (or \$3,600 in the case of a widow with minor children) the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 3906. A bill to permit the city of Oakland, Calif., to count certain land acquisition costs as part of the development cost of a proposed facility for purposes of the neighborhood facility grant program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 3907. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 3908. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Merlin division, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3909. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Illinois Valley division, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 3910. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide for an older Americans community service program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3911. A bill to establish a National Commission on Public Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3912. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the purpose of strengthening and facilitating mutual cooperation and assistance, including training of personnel, in the administration and en-

forcement of that act and of State and local laws relating to food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3913. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to improve the safety and reliability of drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3914. A bill to amend section 329 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the naturalization of persons through active-duty service in the Armed Forces of the United States in Vietnam during combatant activities in Vietnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3915. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make the robbery of a cooperative bank, which is a member of the Federal home loan bank, a crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3916. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3917. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home shall be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 3918. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Biscayne National Monument in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 3919. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southwest Idaho water development project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 3920. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3921. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 3922. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3923. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 3924. A bill to exempt from the interest equalization tax certain acquisitions made before the enactment of the Interest Equalization Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 3925. A bill to prohibit mutilation and desecration of the national flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 3926. A bill to provide that Columbus Day shall be a legal holiday for officers and employees of the United States in each State in which such day is designated as a legal State holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 3927. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude from that act's minimum wage coverage persons employed in agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 3928. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be

reimbursed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 3929. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 3930. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 3931. A bill to amend the act of April 3, 1952; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 3932. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 3933. A bill to promote the advancement of science and the education of scientists through a national program of institutional grants to the colleges and universities of the United States; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 3934. A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 3935. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 3936. A bill to provide that chief judges of circuits and chief judges of district courts shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 66; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 3937. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to eliminate certain requirements for the furnishing of nursing home care in the case of veterans hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration in Alaska or Hawaii; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 3938. A bill making a supplemental appropriation to carry out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 3939. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37 of the United States Code to permit members of the Armed Forces to provide for their dependents in certain circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 3940. A bill to restrict imports of dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 3941. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 3942. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 3943. A bill to amend the Appalachian Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 3944. A bill to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLANTON:

H.R. 3945. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the State of Tennessee for the use

of Memphis State University, Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 3946. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an 8-percent, across-the-board benefit increase, and subsequent increases based on rises in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 3947. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3948. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct (as trade or business expenses) the expenses of travel, meals, and lodging while employed away from his regular place of abode; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3949. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 3950. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 3951. A bill to preserve the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 3952. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code in order to increase by 20 percent the income limitations imposed by that chapter on persons entitled to pensions thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3953. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; and to provide that any such increases shall not be considered as income for purposes of determining eligibility for pension under title 38 of the United States Code (veterans' benefits); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 3954. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited sample drug products and other potentially harmful items, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3955. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the entitlement period for educational assistance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 3956. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3957. A bill to strengthen State and local governments, to provide the States with additional financial resources to improve elementary and secondary education by returning a portion of the Federal revenue to the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ERLBORN:

H.R. 3958. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT (by request):

H.R. 3959. A bill to liberalize the provisions for payment of the \$5,000 death gratuity; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3960. A bill to authorize the chartering of organizations to insure conventional mortgage loans, to authorize the creation of secondary market organizations for conven-

tional and other mortgage loans, to authorize the issuance of debentures upon the security of insured or guaranteed mortgages, and to create a joint supervisory board to charter and examine such organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 3961. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes, effective January 1, 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 3962. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an 8-percent, across-the-board benefit increase, and subsequent increases based on rises in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 3963. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3964. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3965. A bill to provide for construction of a protective glass screen in the spectators galleries of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3966. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is mentally retarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 3967. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the State of Tennessee for the use of Memphis State University, Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 3968. A bill to authorize the transfer of a vessel to the Los Angeles Unified School District for nontransportation use in the training of merchant marine personnel; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3969. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide a grant-in-aid program to assist the States in furnishing aid and services with respect to children under foster care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 3970. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an 8-percent across-the-board benefit increase, and subsequent increases based on rises in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCLURE:

H.R. 3971. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southwest Idaho water development project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 3972. A bill to enable the District of Columbia to participate in the health and medical assistance benefits made available by the Social Security Amendments of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3973. A bill to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, as amended, and the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, approved June 6, 1892, as amended, to exempt from licensing thereunder physicians and dentists; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 3974. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 3975. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3976. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to court leave for Government employees appearing as witnesses on behalf of a State in any judicial proceeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 3977. A bill to amend section 212(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt from the literacy requirement of section 212(a)(25) certain additional relatives of U.S. citizens and permanent resident aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3978. A bill to amend section 331 of title 46 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3979. A bill to amend section 6409(b) (1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 3980. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional personal exemption for a taxpayer who is a student; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 3981. A bill to amend subsection 1331 (c) of title 10, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3982. A bill to amend section 409 of title 37, United States Code, relating to the transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3983. A bill to provide for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Waterway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 3984. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase the annuities of Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3985. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3986. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited sample drug products and other potentially harmful items, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3987. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to remove the income limitations for purpose of receiving pensions for veterans who are over 70 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3988. A bill to amend the war orphans' educational assistance program of title 38, United States Code, to extend to wives of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled as a result of a service-connected disability and to widows of veterans who died of service-connected disability the same educational benefits which are provided for war orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3989. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of payments under retirement plans of certain exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3990. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer or spouse who has had a laryngectomy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3991. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3992. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3993. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3994. A bill to amend titles I, IV, X, XVI, XVIII, and XIX of the Social Security Act to require that drugs provided by, or under programs receiving Federal financial assistance pursuant to such titles, must be prescribed and furnished on a nonproprietary or generic basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 3995. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 3996. A bill to reserve certain public lands for a national scenic rivers system, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 3997. A bill to establish a National Commission on Public Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 3998. A bill to establish a National Institute for Crime Prevention and Control; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 3999. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4000. A bill to change the period of eligibility under the war orphans' educational assistance program of title 38 of the United States Code from the period between an eligible person's 18th and 23d birthdays to the period between his 18th and 26th birthdays; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 4001. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 4002. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4003. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 4004. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4005. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 4006. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN:

H.R. 4007. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 4008. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guaranty Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate Philadelphia, Pa., as the site of a world's fair commemorating the 200th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 219. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.J. Res. 220. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.J. Res. 221. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 222. Joint resolution relating to U.S. diplomatic relations with the Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.J. Res. 223. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 224. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLBORN:

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution to provide early appropriations for Federal educational programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HANNA:

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution concerning a World Farm Center; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market

economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOLE:

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESCH:

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should

(1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MIZE:

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MYERS:

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American

and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WINN:

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the public interest the administration should (1) cease and desist in its efforts to enforce selective economic discrimination against American farmers and ranchers by deliberately depressing farm prices, and (2) use the various legislative authorities at its disposal to improve and enhance farm prices in order to build a strong and viable market economy for agriculture, the cornerstone of American and free world prosperity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H. Res. 184. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to study the problems of urban areas; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 185. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H. Res. 186. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Res. 187. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow televising and broadcasting of proceedings in the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 188. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for the broadcasting by radio and television of the hearings conducted by standing committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H. Res. 189. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Education and Labor, and to create a new Committee on Education and a new Committee on Labor; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. Res. 190. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Res. 191. Resolution for printing 2,000 additional copies of parts II and III of "United States-South African Relations" for use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 4009. A bill for the relief of Emerson Vinuya Reyes and his wife, Violeta Sandoval Tabernilla Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4010. A bill for the relief of Virginia Doronio Anulacion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 4011. A bill for the relief of Branko Cule; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4012. A bill for the relief of Antonios Koklas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4013. A bill for the relief of Bozidar Racic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4014. A bill for the relief of Merickston L. Nicholson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 4015. A bill for the relief of T. Michael Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 4016. A bill for the relief of Consuelo Guia Ramoso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4017. A bill for the relief of Chi Koo Pyun and Pong Sun Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 4018. A bill for the relief of Venovia Anthony; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 4019. A bill for the relief of Thiak Hui Lor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4020. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria do Vau Machado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4021. A bill for the relief of the O'Brien Dieselectric Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 4022. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret G. Bremner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4023. A bill for the relief of Rafaela Lono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER (by request):

H.R. 4024. A bill for the relief of Herbert L. Johnston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 4025. A bill for the relief of Miss Yolanda Bolling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 4026. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vanda Paolini and Carla Paolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4027. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zoe Stavropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4028. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Cappello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4029. A bill for the relief of Vito Cangialosi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 4030. A bill for the relief of Yong Chin Sager; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 4031. A bill for the relief of George P. Panagiotopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4032. A bill for the relief of Carlo Bianchi & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4033. A bill for the relief of Anna Montalto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4034. A bill for the relief of Francesco Blondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4035. A bill for the relief of Luciano Ferrarello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4036. A bill for the relief of Pietro Ingoglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4037. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Giallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4038. A bill for the relief of Carmine Buffolino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4039. A bill for the relief of Natalino Colatosti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4040. A bill for the relief of Biagio Colatosti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4041. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4042. A bill for the relief of Angelo Fullone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 4043. A bill for the relief of Stefania Wtodarska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4044. A bill for the relief of Dr. Incarangel Alzona Naval; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4045. A bill for the relief of Antonino Bellavia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts (by request):

H.R. 4046. A bill for the relief of Nino and Maria Theresa Vespa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 4047. A bill for the relief of Phillip Mazzella and his minor children, Michele Mazzella and Libera Maria Mazzella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4048. A bill for the relief of Miguel Vargas Diaz and his wife, Eva Almazon Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 4049. A bill for the relief of Anthony Di Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 4050. A bill for the relief of Chi Wei (Austin) Shu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4051. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Rossi Pacifico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 4052. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mohammad Ali Rajaei and wife, Mrs. Parvin (Ghazlaskar) Rajaei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4053. A bill for the relief of Arun Kumar Pattai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4054. A bill for the relief of Eloy C. Navarro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4055. A bill for the relief of the estate of Newton Watson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 4056. A bill for the relief of Kyu Whan Whang and spouse, nee Young Won Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4057. A bill for the relief of Moy Woon Man; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4058. A bill for the relief of JE-IL Brick Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4059. A bill for the relief of Hom Siu (King) Wong and Lim Chung Huo Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4060. A bill for the relief of Owen C. Boyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 4061. A bill for the relief of Ricardo Magsalin Eduvas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4062. A bill for the relief of Ngon Suey Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4063. A bill for the relief of Michael Valle Velasquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 4064. A bill for the relief of Agnes C. Stowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 4065. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jasmine T. Boyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4066. A bill for the relief of Carmela Asero Gelardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4067. A bill for the relief of Radomir and Ruzica Mihaljlovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 4068. A bill for the relief of Haviv Schieber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

16. By the SPEAKER: Petition of City Council, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to legislation providing for an orderly and mandatory expansion of the national cemetery system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

17. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to appropriations for the space effort; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

18. Also, petition of Mary T. Abbondondolo and Michael Abbondondolo, Glen Head, Long Island, N.Y., relative to their constitutional rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Colgate University Meets Challenge of Ford Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1967

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that Colgate University in Hamilton, N.Y., has just taken a giant step forward in guaranteeing its future as a leading, independent college of the liberal arts—one of the finest in the Nation.

Three years ago, Colgate President Vincent M. Barnett, Jr., was invited to accept the greatest challenge ever presented to the university in its 150-year history. The Ford Foundation offered

Colgate a \$2.2 million grant on the condition that the university raise \$6.6 million in eligible matching funds before June 30, 1967. That challenge not only was accepted and met, but was exceeded by more than \$200,000, 6 months before the deadline. That is a significant and impressive accomplishment of which everyone associated with the endeavor should be justifiably proud.

This is but a portion of an overall success story at Colgate. With support coming from many and varied sources, including several Federal grants, the university to date has raised \$16 million toward a \$23 million 5-year goal which is expected to be reached by 1969, Colgate's sesquicentennial anniversary.

The future of higher education in America depends, in large measure, upon the continued success and growth of the independent colleges. It is with this thought in mind, coupled with my par-

ticular interest in this fine university that lies within the district I am privileged to represent in the Congress, that I commend Colgate and give well-deserved praise to its family of supporters.

Fine Arts Center Created in Anderson, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1967

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the cultural accomplishment of Anderson, Ind., should be acclaimed as an inspiration to similar U.S. communities. This primarily industrial city of 65,000 people has illustrated that efforts to improve a city's